

## NICÆA : A NOTABLE CENTENARY

325-1925

**B**Y a long succession of historical writers from Gibbon to Mr. H. G. Wells the First Œcumenical Council of Nicæa has been made the object of contemptuous ridicule. The questions raised by the heresy of Arius have been represented as futile disputes about a single Greek letter in a single incomprehensible Greek word. The political significance of the whole matter has been ignored. The thing has been made into a silly joke; and the most profound questions ever settled by the mind of man have been treated as a series of idiotic verbal trifles, about which no sane person would waste a thought.

In June of this year it will be sixteen centuries since the assembling of the 318 bishops, who composed the First Council of Nicæa.<sup>1</sup> It may be interesting, therefore, to attempt a brief examination of the circumstances attending its inception, and to estimate, in broad outline, the significance of its tremendous achievements.

The Arian heresy, which was destined for more than half a century to convulse Christendom from end to end, originated in Alexandria. A sermon preached by St. Alexander, the bishop of that city, had been warmly criticized by a young priest named Arius, who affected to discover traces of Sabelianism in the teaching of his bishop. Arius seems to have been a typical product of the Alexandrine schools,—a brilliant scholar, a master of debate, a lover of metaphysical subtleties, and possessed of that precocity of intellect,—a desire of argument for its own sake, a refusal to admit himself beaten or to retrace his own steps,—which, in a less exaggerated degree, appeared in Origen and Clement of Alexandria. The man was a born heresiarch. In the discussions with St. Alexander which followed, Arius, following up the line of thought, which had suggested his strictures, made the first explicit statement of the heresy which bears his name.

St. Alexander was quick to realize the danger. He saw

<sup>1</sup> Cardinal Newman, in his "Arians in the 4th Century," gives June 19th as the date of the opening session.

from the first that it was not a matter of somewhat daring speculation into unexplored corners of natural theology; still less was it an unimportant quibble in dialectics. It was a question of the survival or destruction of the Catholic Faith, and St. Alexander did not hesitate in his line of action. He convened a synod of the Egyptian bishops and excommunicated Arius.

Arius was ready for this and, in a letter to Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia, appealed against the sentence. The spark had fired the train. Arianism flared up with astounding rapidity all over Egypt, Palestine and Asia Minor; and the crafty politician, who occupied the See of Nicomedia, at once showed himself its most zealous champion. Warmly supporting the dogmatical position of Arius, he promulgated a variety of letters in which he censured the Bishop of Alexandria both for his hasty ill-treatment of Arius and for the obliquities of his teaching.

The letter to all the Eastern episcopates, in which St. Alexander vindicated his own position, was a masterpiece of clearness and simplicity, and forms the best introduction that one could desire to the study of the controversy.

To our beloved and most honoured fellow-ministers of the Catholic Church everywhere [wrote the bishop]<sup>1</sup> Alexander sends his greetings in the Lord.

Inasmuch as the Catholic Church is one body, and we are commanded in the Scriptures to maintain the bond of unanimity and peace, it consequently becomes us to write and acquaint one another with the condition of things amongst each of us, in order that if one member suffers or rejoice, we may either sympathize with each other or rejoice together. Know, therefore, that there have recently arisen in our diocese lawless and anti-Christian men, teaching apostasy such as one may justly consider and denominate the forerunner of Antichrist.

. . . The dogmas they assert in utter contrariety to the Scriptures, and wholly of their own devising are these:—that God was not always a father, but that there was a period when He was not a father; that the Word of God was not from eternity, but was made out of nothing; for that the ever-existing God (the I AM,—the eternal One) made Him, who did not previously exist, out of

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in Socrates, H.E. i. 16.

nothing. Thus they consider there was a time when He did not exist, inasmuch as, according to their philosophy, the Son is a creature and a work.

. . . "Wherefore," say they, "He is as to His nature mutable and susceptible of change, as all other rational creatures are; hence the Word is alien to and other than the essence of God; and the Father is inexplicable by the Son, and invisible to Him, for neither does the Son perfectly and accurately know the Father, nor can He distinctly see Him."

. . . Someone accordingly asked whether the Word of God could be changed, as the devil has been; and they feared not to say, "Yes, He could; for being begotten and created, He is susceptible of change." We then, with the bishops of Egypt and Libya, being assembled together to the number of nearly a hundred, have anathematized Arius for his shameless avowal of these heresies, together with all such as have countenanced them. Yet the partisans of Eusebius have received them, endeavouring to blend falsehood with truth and that which is impious with that which is sacred. But they shall not prevail, for the truth must triumph; light has no fellowship with darkness, nor has Christ any concord with Belial.

Who ever heard such blasphemies? Or what man of any piety is there now hearing them that is not horror-struck, and stops his ears, lest the filth of these expressions should pollute his sense of hearing? Who that hears John saying, "In the beginning was the Word," does not condemn those that dare to affirm that there was a period when the Word was not? Or who hearing the Gospel of "the only-begotten Son" and that "all things were made by Him," will not abhor those that pronounce the Son to be the one of the things made?

. . . Seeing then that our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ has Himself enjoined it and has also by the Apostle given us intimation concerning such men, we, having ourselves heard their impiety, have in consequence anathematized them, as we before said, and declared them to be alienated from the Catholic Church and Faith.

We see, therefore, that the whole controversy was raised from the first far above the sphere of metaphysical debate.

The basic truths of the Christian revelation were challenged; for the admission of the Arian position leads at once to a denial of the Catholic teaching of the Incarnation, the Atonement and the Resurrection. Two things would have followed logically from the triumph of Arius: first, the destruction of the whole idea of a corporate and divinely instituted Church; and second, the bringing of the Christian Faith into line with Zoroastrianism and the mystic Egyptian cults of Isis and Hathor. The modernist, with his ideas of an "invisible Church" may well be reminded that, if Pope Julius and St. Athanasius and St. Alexander and the bishops assembled at Nicæa had thought as he does, the world to-day would know no more of Jesus Christ than it does of Jupiter or Serapis or Thor or Manes,—probably less.

The promulgation of St. Alexander's encyclical served both to rally the forces of the Church and to increase the angry zeal of the Arians. The controversy became more general and more acrimonious. The Emperor Constantine had a spacious palace at Nicomedia; and the wily Eusebius, bishop of that city, who, as we have seen, had openly adopted the Arian position, lost no time in gaining the ear of the sovereign. He deplored, he said, the contentious raging within the Church and he regretted the peevish excitement of the Bishop of Alexandria, who had shown himself so foolishly inflexible over a mere dialectical trifle. It was well known that the controversy amongst the Christians had excited the contemptuous ridicule of the pagans and was frequently burlesqued in the theatres, amidst roars of laughter.

It was hardly to be imagined that the blunt and soldierly Emperor would be in a position to arrive at a true estimate of the position. He never posed as a theologian; he knew very little Greek; and it is doubtful whether, at any period of his life, he fully realized the significance of the questions at issue. But Christianity was the official religion of the Empire; and the Emperor, who viewed the controversy itself with careless and amused indifference, could not tolerate the laughter of the pagans. To laugh at the Church was, in effect, to laugh at the Empire,—a much more serious matter. For the Imperial tradition of the Augustans and the Flavians was still strong; to subscribe to the official religion of the Empire was regarded as the first and most elementary form of loyalty to the central power.

Constantine accordingly addressed an open letter to



Alexander and Arius. It was a well-meant epistle,—a call for friendly settlement of the dispute. But it betrayed not the smallest apprehension of the controversy, and only the haziest acquaintance with the fundamental doctrines of the Church. The Emperor speaks of the "disputatious cavilling of ill-employed leisure," which has given rise to the whole business. The disputants, he says, "pertinaciously contend with one another about matters of small or scarcely the least importance"; the argument is "rather consistent with puerile thoughtlessness, than suitable to the intelligence of priests and prudent men."

"Return again therefore," he concludes, "to a state of reconciliation; and by so doing give me back tranquil days and nights free from care; that to me also there may be some pleasure in the pure light, and that a cheerful serenity may be preserved to me during the rest of my life."

The sudden intrusion of this extremely personal note was all very well; but the Catholic bishops could hardly be expected to regard the preservation of the "cheerful serenity" of the Imperial countenance as of greater moment than the preservation of the Catholic Faith. The complete capitulation of the Arians would have been the only possible prelude to the settlement of the dispute; and Arianism, instead of growing weaker, was daily growing stronger. The question of the proper time for the observance of Easter, which had cropped up frequently since the times of Pope Victor, again came into sudden prominence. Constantine began to realize that the matter was not, perhaps, as trifling as he had been led to suppose. On the advice of Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, in Spain,<sup>1</sup> and of others, he summoned a general council of bishops to meet at the little town of Nicæa, in Bithynia.

The part played by the Pope in the summoning of the council is not clear. Pope Sylvester, on account of his extreme old age, was represented by two legates, Vitus and Vincent. Constantine did not act as president of the council, for we are told that, after his opening speech he left the discussions to "the presidents of the synod." The sixth General Council, held in 680, stated explicitly that "Con-

<sup>1</sup> Hosius had been sent to Egypt to investigate the conditions of the strife. He was one of the few bishops who remained steadfastly loyal to St. Athanasius and was banished by Constantius at the Council of Milan, together with Pope Liberius. See Sozomen, H.E. i. 16, Philostorgius, H.E. i. 7, Socrates, H.E. i. 7; ii. 31, etc.

stantine and Sylvester summoned the great Synod of Nicæa." In the extant list of subscribers to the canons, Hosius of Cordova's name stands first, followed by those of the Papal legates; and Hosius signs expressly, "In the name of the Church of Rome, the Churches of Italy, Spain and all the West."<sup>1</sup>

The proceedings of the Council fall into three main groups. In the earlier stages the Emperor was surrounded by excited priests and laymen, orthodox and heretical, praying for redress of private grievances and the granting of purely personal petitions. This unedifying business was wisely stopped by Constantine, who summoned all the disputants to meet him on a certain day, and kindly, but firmly refused to adjudicate in any single case.

"Devote your attention," he concluded, "to those subjects connected with the Faith, on account of which we are assembled."<sup>2</sup>

He then appointed a day, on which the discussion of these tremendous subjects should be begun in open court.

The interval was spent by the assembled bishops in private interrogations of Arius and his followers, and in clearing away irrelevant details from the main questions at issue. Prominent in these preliminary discussions was a young deacon from Alexandria, who accompanied St. Alexander as the Patriarch's secretary. His vigour and enthusiasm, the exactness of his knowledge and the skill of his rhetoric soon attracted attention. The surprise of the Arian leaders soon turned to veiled hostility; this aggressive young upstart, they told one another, was really becoming a serious nuisance. Such was their first encounter with the most determined opponent they were ever destined to meet,—the man who for forty-six years was to be the object of the hatred and jealousy of every heretic in the Empire, and but for whom Arianism would probably have swept the Catholic Faith from Eastern Christendom. His name was Athanasius,—the central and dominating figure of the fourth century, and one of the most gallant gentlemen that have ever lived.

On the appointed day the bishops assembled and the First General Council of the Catholic Church was formally opened

<sup>1</sup> See Adrian Fortescue, "The Orthodox Eastern Church," p. 75. Sozomen says that "Julius, bishop of Rome, was unable to be present,"—a curious mistake, for Julius was not elected Pope until eleven years later.

<sup>2</sup> Sozomen, H.E. i. 17.

by the Emperor. A complimentary address to the sovereign was read by Eusebius of Cæsarea, the historian;<sup>1</sup> and Constantine replied briefly in Latin, his discourse being translated by a bystander. The scene must have been a tremendously impressive one, and Eusebius himself has elaborately described it in his "Life of Constantine."<sup>2</sup> The onlooker would have been grimly reminded of the recent persecutions under Diocletian and Licinius. For Paphnucius, Bishop of the Thebaid, was present with his empty eye-socket; and Paul of Neo-Cæsarea who "had been deprived of the use of both hands by the application of a red-hot iron, by which the nerves which gave motions to the muscles had been contracted and destroyed."<sup>3</sup> These men were not hair-splitting dialecticians; they were Christian warriors, rallying once more to the defence of the Faith they loved.

Three hundred and eighteen bishops had thus assembled from all over the Empire to debate upon the absolutely fundamental difference between the Catholic Faith and all other religions that had ever existed amongst men,—to decide whether our Lord was the Son of God, or whether He was just a rather exceptional man, and no more,—whether the Catholic Faith could claim to be a Divine revelation, or whether it was a purely human code of ethics and belief,—and whether, if the latter proposition were true, it might not be better to scrap a lot of the rubbish that had gathered round it during the passage of years, and to bring it into reasonable agreement with the established religious practices of bygone days, and into proper subordination to the Imperial Government.

Of course the ultimate issue had never been in doubt for a moment. When the conference opened, it was known that seventeen of the bishops favoured the Arian position. The final decision was absolutely unanimous.<sup>4</sup> Arius was condemned to banishment and the Emperor published a letter, ordering that his works should be burnt and that the possession of them should be regarded as a capital crime. Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognas of Nicæa, who had made a

<sup>1</sup> By St. Eustathius of Antioch, according to Theodoret.

<sup>2</sup> *iii.* 7-14.

<sup>3</sup> Theodoret, *H.E.* *i.* 7.

<sup>4</sup> There is some confusion on this point. Socrates (*H.E.* *i.* 8) says that five bishops dissented. In the synodical letter of the Council two names are mentioned as sharing the full condemnation of Arius. Sozomen says that the decision was unanimous (*H.E.* *i.* 21). There can be no doubt that some of the assents were reluctant and half-hearted.

reluctant assent to the decisions of the council, refused to agree to the banishment of Arius and were consequently deprived of their bishoprics.

The council then promulgated the following profession of faith, as the test of orthodoxy:—

We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible: and in our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the only begotten of the Father, that is of the substance of the Father; God of God and Light of Light; true God of true God; begotten, not made, consubstantial with the Father; by whom all things were made, both which are in Heaven and on earth: Who, for the sake of us men and on account of our salvation, descended, became incarnate and was made man; suffered, arose again the third day, and ascended into the Heavens, and will come again to judge the living and the dead. We also believe in the Holy Spirit.

But the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes those who say that there was a time when the Son of God was not, and that He was not before He was begotten, and that He was made from that which did not exist; or who assert that He is of other substance or essence than the Father, or that He was created, or is susceptible of change.

These things were summarized by the council in a letter addressed to the churches of Alexandria. After describing the various phases of the discussions on Arianism, the letter continues:—

We have also gratifying intelligence to communicate to you relative to unity of judgment on the subject of the most holy feast of Easter, for this point also has been happily settled through your prayers: so that all the brethren in the East who have hitherto kept this festival when the Jews did, will henceforth conform to the Romans and to us, and to all, who from the earliest time have observed our period of celebrating Easter.

Rejoicing therefore in this most desirable conclusion, and in the general unanimity and peace, as well as in the extirpation of all heresy, receive with greater honour and the more abundant love our fellow-minister and your bishop Alexander; who has greatly delighted us by his

presence, and even at his advanced age has undergone extraordinary exertions, in order that peace might be re-established amongst you. Pray on behalf of us all that the decisions, to which we have so justly come, may be inviolably maintained through Almighty God and our Lord Jesus Christ, together with the Holy Spirit; to Whom be glory for ever. Amen.

On no one did the happenings at Nicæa have a more profound impression than on the Emperor. One always has an unpleasant feeling, which one would willingly believe to be unjustifiable, if one could, that the son of St. Helena cared more for the prestige of his Imperial office than for the welfare of the Church, and that he always regarded the latter as subsidiary to the former. But in the stream of letters, in which he celebrated the triumphant conclusion of the Council of Nicæa, he appears at his best. There is a temperate wisdom and a note of sincere piety in his open letter to the Churches on the subject of Easter, which are conspicuous by their absence during the major portion of his reign. He had realized, too, that Arianism was not a matter of verbal subtleties, the result of "puerile thoughtlessness" and "disputatious cavilling." Now he speaks of the "fearful enormity of the blasphemies which some have shamelessly uttered concerning the mighty Saviour," and of the "moderation and intellectual superiority" of the bishops assembled at Nicæa. He is pleased to note "from the flourishing condition of public affairs, how great has been the grace of Divine power"; and "now that that persecuting dragon Licinius has, by the Providence of the Most High God and our instrumentality, been removed from the administration of public affairs, I imagine that the Divine Power has been made manifest to all." The God of Constantine was emphatically a God of battles.

The canons of Nicæa are the "Magna Carta" of Catholicism. They mark the beginning of that great work of crystallization and definition, which, in a sense, is only made necessary by heresy, and which is of the essence of the Church's mission. Just as the Council of Trent, confronted by Protestantism, defined in fact and mode the traditional Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence, so the First Council of Nicæa, confronted by Arianism, defined the perfect Divinity of our Lord. Both articles, in absolute entirety,

were radical in Catholic doctrine from the first day of Pentecost. If Arius had expressly challenged the Sacramental Presence of our Lord in the Sacrifice of the Mass, its objective reality would have been defined in the fourth century, although, of course, if one were an Arian, one would have implicitly rejected the whole Catholic Sacramental tradition. The definitions of Trent cannot be other than sequels to the definitions of Nicæa.

In its relation to Arianism, Nicæa was simply the Church's ultimatum; it was a declaration of war, the just war against heresy, which is always necessary for the peace of the Church. But, owing to the relations between Church and Empire, the decrees of the Council came to have a political aspect also. For the Arian heresy was to become almost at once the sword of the unfaithful Emperors. As Protestantism was made a weapon of policy by the pride and ambition of princes in the sixteenth century, so Arianism, in like manner, was employed by the vicious and militaristic successors of Constantine. Only one Emperor was sufficiently disgusted by the sordid intrigues of the Arian bishops which, under the guise of a zeal for dogmatic truth, polluted the very air of the Eastern Empire, as to wash his hands of the whole business: and Julian the Apostate for all his Paganism is very far from being the most offensive of the fourth century sovereigns.

The history of the vital half century following the Council of Nicæa may, indeed, be regarded in two ways, which appear different and yet are actually identical. It was the history of the conflict between the Catholic Faith and the Arian heresy; and it was the history of the conflict between St. Athanasius and the Eastern Emperors. You may, if you will, trace the whole thing back to the "iota," but do not imagine that you are thereby minimizing its importance. It would be interesting to follow out the parallel between the religious events of the fourth century and those of the sixteenth. The Arians were true Protestants in their use of material force in the supposed cause of orthodoxy and primitive observance. Aided by the secular arm they destroyed for a time the unity of Christendom, though not that of the Catholic Church which is indestructible. But the hand that took the sword perished by it. The word of the Holy Spirit spoken at Nicæa ultimately prevailed, and the world which had "groaned to find itself Arian," soon recovered its



spiritual health. In like manner before the voice of Trent the multiform heresies of Protestantism went down in confusion, in spite of the impious support of kings and princes. Thought, freed from the "bondage" of Rome, has lost itself in puerile and self-contradictory philosophies, and the will of man, despising her guidance, has plunged into every sort of corruption. But the word of the Lord remaineth for ever, and Nicæa, like Trent, remains a rallying point for the forces of virtue and light. In a passage of wonderful insight and eloquence,<sup>1</sup> Mr. Chesterton long ago described the course of the Church amid the heresies that beset it as "one whirling adventure." "In my vision," he cries, "the heavenly chariot flies thundering through the ages, the dull heresies sprawling and prostrate, the wild truth reeling but erect." The weary world, dazed and demoralized by the catastrophe of the war and deafened by the babel-voices of self-sent prophets longs once again for the trumpet-call of a General Council which like Nicæa shall proclaim anew undying truth and the glory of that Name "whereby alone it behoveth us to be saved."

A. L. MAYCOCK.

<sup>1</sup> "Orthodoxy," pp. 183—185.

## FULL CIRCLE

**Y**ESTERDAY, the little old lady in charge of the branch post office effaced the last circle on my "Ring" paper—as correctly and cautiously as she had effaced the first—and handed me my last payment. Not, however, without gently reprimanding me for calling a day late.

That was the sore point between us always: the one difference. Even after years of experience, I used to call on her, absent-mindedly, on the wrong day of the week: and, occasionally, even missed a week altogether. But no matter how admiringly I regarded the faded stationery on the counter, she invariably took me to task for my irregularity.

"Let me see, Mr. Smith: Wednesday is *your* day, isn't it?" she would ask, peering at me cunningly over her tarnished gold spectacles. And I had to confess shamefacedly that it was.

"Ah yes. . . . But to-day is—Thursday, you know. . . . Widows and Orphans!" That was all. But in her eyes, it was more than enough. An ex-soldier calling on the day set apart for the Widows' and Orphans' Allowances put himself beyond the pale.

Or it was Friday. . . "Old Age Pensioners, you know. . . I'm sorry, but you will have to call again next Wednesday. You see, I have only just enough money to go round, and your pension is—how much?"

"Seven and sixpence," I would remind her, making it sound as small as possible.

"Ah yes. . . . Seven and sixpence; so it is. It would mean quite emptying my till. I'm afraid it will have to be next week after all."

And next week, of course, it was fifteen shillings, and she would scold me for letting the pension "accumulate." There were, it is true, occasional days when she melted and paid me; but never without first delivering a curtain lecture on the virtues of punctuality. And when she did actually pick out the book of coupons, she scrutinized it as if she suspected a false impersonation and an impending forgery.

"You see," she would always explain, "there are two Mr. Smiths—both ex-soldiers; and I have to be careful that

I don't pay one of them twice or else the other would go short. . . ." But the other Mr. Smith was evidently a model of what a pensioner should be, and was so punctual that I never even caught sight of his coat-tails.

Usually, quite a little crowd of Old Age Pensioners or Widows or Orphans would come in during my cross-examination and gather round to hear the verdict delivered. To cover up my confusion I would purchase a shilling's worth of stamps, a packet of horrible envelopes or a villianously-ruled pocket book, and beat a quick retreat. I have still sufficient stationery on hand to last me until the next war.

But I shall miss the little old lady and her Widows and Orphans and Old Age Pensioners: much more than the pension itself that caused all the pother, for that had dwindled to such "small proportions" that even Ben Jonson himself might have failed to perceive its just beauties.

Twelve months ago, I made a great effort to draw the whole of the last year's payments in one glorious lump sum. It seemed to me that it were better and cheaper for the Government to pay me one such sum rather than fifty-two separate seven-and-sixpences. I even dreamed of taking a cheque to the south of France and getting really fit again on it. I wrote a polite note to that effect to the Comptroller General. He, in his turn, wrote me an equally cordial note referring me to an obscure local committee. The local committee wanted to know whether I intended "setting up in business for myself" on the money. Was I going to open a fruit shop or begin a newsagency, for example? In that case, provided I sent them the original invoice for any necessary article, they might see their way to settle it. . . . Three interviews failed to procure me the joy of handling the coveted lump sum myself, so there was nothing else for it but to go back to the old lady and be interrogated, identified and reprimanded all over again. Force of habit will certainly drive me to her office on some future Wednesday or (terrible thought—Friday!) for another payment; and I can picture her indignation and my horror when she finds she is being asked to compound a felony.

But there is at least one bright feature about this final payment. It means that there will be no more Medical Boards. . . . To the last, there was something humiliating about being summoned to appear before the inquisitors in their dismal room; something nauseating about having to

strip at the word of command, and being punched and prodded like a prize heifer. And always there was the feeling that one was suspected of malingering—even though the suspicion may have been quite unfounded. At any rate one could not but hope that one's crazy heart would do its tricks properly and convincingly like the acrobat one knew it (too truly) to be. . . . One could not but enjoy the perplexed expression on the faces of the more human members of the Board, when it bounded away at 150 beats to the minute, or slowed down to 56 just when it was expected to gallop. And one will always remember with a kind of pride the red-letter days when it did 160 and almost out-paced the recorder's stop-watch. . . .

The only thing that made the Boards endurable was the opportunity they afforded of mixing again with other pensioners in the ante-rooms. Apart from the *bon camaraderie*, one will miss the thrill of hearing real soldiers pulverizing the Government for its pusillanimity; for there was always some old fellow there hinting darkly of service in Afghanistan, Mafeking and the Punjab, and making the last war seem very small beer indeed—who could expound the anomalies of the complicated pensions law like a lawyer; and who made one feel that he ought to have been called to the (real) bar long ago. One had only to listen to him quietly for a few minutes to burn with indignation and to feel eager to face the verbal fire in the other room.

All that is ended. . . . One has travelled the full circle, and it is fitting that one's journey should be symbolized, as it were, by a ring.

Ten years ago, with a stout heart, one set out to make military history. To-day, one realizes a little sadly that one has only succeeded in making medical history. For, though one's name will never shine in the annals of the field, the curious antics of one's heart—carefully recorded and docketed—may yet win from a future medical student a glow of admiration.

And now—cut off from the poor glory and the great meanness of war one slips back to the ranks from whence one sprang, taking up again with a glad, if tricky heart, the insignificant rôle and the sham freedom of the Private Citizen.

ALFRED J. BROWN.

## PEACE AND THE SWORD

**T**HAT peace can come only through the truth and that the re-christianizing of Western civilization is the only means of preventing its destruction by civil and international bloodshed, is a conviction which is becoming more and more impressed on the minds, not only of Catholics but of sincere workers for international harmony among the sects outside the fold. In the eyes of Catholics, at any rate, there is but one final and effectual remedy for the maladies of society and the unrest of the world—the restoration of all things in Christ by the universal acceptance of the full revelation made by God through His Church and the attainment of the peace that comes of charity. Yet, when we preach the gospel of peace, our adversaries are not slow to urge one difficulty against us, namely, that the peace of the Lord which we so trustfully proclaim does, indeed, surpass all understanding, since it seems to involve all the horrors of militarism which it is supposed to assuage. The Ages of Faith,—for this is the pith of the indictment,—were a long orgy of bloodshed from beginning to end. The pious and accommodating Froissart, himself a priest, seems to endorse the common opinion of his time that war is the proper pastime for a Christian gentleman and that Christian nations are kept in proper condition by fighting one another. If we try to explain that the Church, in her mission of peace, merely connived at militarism because she could not help it, we are met with the further objection that many bishops and several Popes were as devoutly given to the use of carnal weapons as the Black Prince himself. We can, alas! only say that they knew not of what spirit they were.

Why, then, when the Church was all-powerful, did she not put down war? This is clearly a difficulty to try the mettle of a controversialist. He has to admit that the Ages of Faith, even at their period of highest achievement in the thirteenth century, were very far indeed from realizing the ideal of universal peace among Christian peoples: still, he will be able to prove that what was then the common faith of Christendom was, after all, the principal cause why civilization did not perish through human passion, that it

always was a tendency making strongly, if gradually and intermittently, for peace and the arts of peace, and that it remains in the present day the only influence that consistently upholds the moral law upon which our present civilization is still, if insecurely, based.

The Church, ruled and administered by fallible men, necessarily takes to some extent the colour of her age: it is due to her divine Spouse that she rises superior to its spirit and successfully withstands its corruption. On the whole she used her spiritual weapons, excommunication and interdict, wisely, to suppress the excessive self-assertion of nations just emerging from utter barbarism, and still like children in their quarrelsome age. Nor, on the whole, were those weapons ineffective. Public opinion was strongly in favour of maternal strictness and the influence of the Church as the centre of peace and unity could do far more than the wisdom of secular diplomatists to extend the reign of law. It is true that in practice her efforts were sometimes disregarded: but the fact that the judgments and penalties in question were recognized by all as operative, must needs have kept the public opinion of Christendom well informed with the idea of peace based on justice. The mind needed no conviction: only the will needed guidance. It is true that the will often refused the guidance offered and defied the sanctions threatened, but it is also true that, by means of the "*Pax Ecclesiae*," "the Truce of God," the privileges of sanctuary and inviolability and the penalties whereby these peaceful influences were enforced—the public mind were gradually taught that the fighting instinct ought not to be indulged except under the highest sanctions. Given the ideal, steady and luminous, and practice in time would have squared with it. As things were, men commonly fought on declared grounds of conscience, well or ill-founded: the appeal, nowadays, is the same, but there is no uniform standard recognized by which conscience can be guided.

The need of a director for national consciences and the latent desire of modern Christendom to refurbish the whole arsenal of mediæval anathemas was curiously indicated during the war by the very people who gloried most in their freedom from ecclesiastical restraint. British Protestants were shocked because the Pope refused to anathematize the German Emperor, while devout Potsdammers were equally scandalized when he could not see his way to excommunicate



his opponents. Both sides forgot that an excommunication presupposes communion and that the military value of a curse depends entirely on the general appreciation of a blessing. If the warring peoples, represented by such typical personalities as Lloyd George and the Kaiser, had owned a common Father in God, their original difficulties could have been as readily settled as those of Chile and Argentina in 1898. As Christ has already been enthroned on the Andes, the next obvious move is to have Him enthroned on the Alps.

In the days when an interdict was regarded as a great national calamity the judicious threat of an anathema was often, in practice, the means of preventing aggressive warfare. If it sometimes happened that the ban itself had to be enforced by military means it commonly meant that public opinion in the offending State was not sufficiently organized to withstand the waywardness of its own feudal Government. In such instances a leader more in tune with the Catholic spirit of his people would come forward to the rescue and prove to the world that there was such a thing in Christendom as a common conscience, ready to assert itself and glowing with hopeful possibilities of binding the whole structure of Christian civilization. Matilda, of Tuscany, and Robert Guiscard, when they stood up for St. Gregory VII. against Henry IV. of Germany, were the champions of the common political conscience of Europe in the early stages of its development. Later on, the League of the Lombard cities, whose merchants knew better than we do that robbery is bad for trade and realized that the feudalism of their day needed blood as well as water for its baptism, allied themselves with Pope Alexander III., and sent Frederick Barbarossa, the common enemy of free trade and free religion, to die decently on the Crusades. Such instances show us, by the way, that the ban of the Church was not an act of unwarranted clerical interference in secular affairs. It was a lead given to popular opinion, an indication of the public tone of Europe and an appeal to the public conscience. If it had been anything else than a moral influence based on accepted supernatural sanctions, it would never have succeeded. Parental interference, as long as it is parental, is a proper exercise of authority and refusal to comply with it is a form of disobedience which, besides being spiritually a sin, is as poisonous to civilized life as foul play is to sport. The kind of rebellion which not merely breaks the rules

of the game but wants to abolish them and denies the existence of any fountain of authority is a disease of modern creation and was unknown to the stronger spirits of the early Middle Ages. The massive recalcitrant personalities with whom the Father of Christendom had to deal were often up against authority, but they did not try to tamper with its springs. When Henry II. murdered St. Thomas Becket, he did not boast that he had emancipated either himself or his country from Popish interference. And he subsequently did penance for insulting an authority which he knew to be closely identified with his own.

The recent canonization of Joan of Arc and the more than tacit approval of the act on the part of non-Catholic nations is a sure sign that, in the implicit consciousness of the world at large, a just and defensive war deserves the blessing of heaven itself. English Protestants, at any rate, are quite willing to acknowledge that, in the war in question, the French were in the right and the English in the wrong, and probably most Protestants who are familiar with the facts will likewise agree that St. Joan's victories were due to a manifest interference of Providence. If God Himself has sometimes given the fullest sanction to the employment of physical force, it is only reasonable to suppose that the Church which He founded has been given a commission to do likewise.

The right of Christendom to defend itself against aggression and the duty of establishing its right by the sanction of a spiritual authority were asserted in principle and justified in practice by the Crusades. The Crusades were, in a sense, a failure, but it is doubtful whether, humanly speaking, there would have remained in Europe such a thing as a Christian civilization without them. Their chief glory is that they revealed and helped to develop a principle of political unity and international brotherhood founded upon the spiritual unity of the Church. They were the outcome of spiritual and moral forces, sufficient in themselves and divine in their origin, but acting upon a very heterogeneous mass. The Crusaders were mostly reclaimed barbarians into whom the leaven of culture and the leaven of grace had only half penetrated. If they had not been sent in herds to fight against the Moslem, they would have been fighting in sections among themselves. They came back, those who did come back, with the seeds of Oriental culture to germinate in

a new environment but, what is more important for our present purpose, they left their mark upon their enemies—the impression, namely, which has never yet been effaced, that Christendom and the West are one. From that day to this, the Oriental mind, especially as represented by militant believers in the world-mission of Islam, has understood more clearly than Christians themselves that there is in the organic body of Western civilization a principle of unity and the bond of a common faith upon the vitality of which that civilization depends for its existence. Not only the Mohammedans but religious Brahmins and philosophic Confucians, who despise us because of our materialism, cannot help regarding the gospel of progress as an integral part of the gospel of Christ. They judge Christianity by its supposed fruits and, since all the fruits that they see are so unspiritual, they naturally assume that our redundant activities are a sign of dying convulsions. If they are hostile, it is not because the dying man is kicking but because he is kicking at them.

The material conquest of the East, within the limits to which it has advanced, is the result of personality. But material without moral conquest cannot endure for long. It ends in gun running and preparations for the retaliatory kick. For moral conquest something more than personality is required. A breed of leading personalities, a permanent succession of Lawrences, John Nicholsons and Herbert Edwardses, is not reared upon moral and spiritual anarchy or amid the ruins of a civilization which disbelieves in the existence of its own soul. Personality, to be permanently effective, must be built on strong, enduring principles which inflame the fighting spirit of adventure and, by their leavening influence, complete the work that adventurers have begun. The adventurers who wield the sword of conquest must be succeeded by a line of administrators who bear the sword of peace, and whose business is not so much to war down the proud as to give them something better to be proud of. This is precisely what Christian rulers who have held sway in the East have always failed to do. They failed in the days of the Crusaders because the Crusaders themselves were but feebly impregnated by the leaven which they were sent to spread. They have failed in modern times because they have studiously purged out the new leaven and generally displayed a decided weakness for the old. British precon-

suls in India and Egypt and French military governors on the verge of the Sahara have so far respected the prejudices of their conquered subjects as to display no religious preferences of their own. The only propaganda they have seriously taken in hand has been that of the trader and the engineer, so much so that, in the mind of Eastern peoples, the engineer has come to be regarded as the chief apostle of Christianity. He has this peculiar advantage that his supremacy is readily acknowledged in his own domain, and his services will be retained when governors and magistrates are asked to quit. Dams, roads and railways are palpable blessings which may be welcomed by any type of civilization without interfering with its spiritual life. They may change its face but they cannot change its heart.

The moral conquest of the East can be accomplished only by gaining the heart of the East, and that can be done only by proving that Christianity is a spiritual force far more potent than any that the East can produce. Imperialism, divorced from Christianity, has failed to achieve any conquest likely to be permanent because it has never professed, except incidentally, to have any spiritual blessings to bestow. The burden of the moral uplift has been thrown upon the shoulders of the financier instead of on those of the missionary, and there is a growing feeling, in the West as well as in the East, that the financier ought himself to be reformed, if not eliminated.

False mysticism and consequent spiritual pride are the Eastern barriers against which the waves of material and spiritual conquest have hitherto beaten in vain. Unless these barriers are removed, the East will never become West, though the West *may* become incorporated with the East. False mysticism can be purged of its dark elements only by the leaven of truth, by spiritual and moral conquest and the ascendancy of Christian ideas. The children of the East are, in this respect, wiser in their generation than those that have inherited the light of Christianity, that they esteem civilization as nothing without religion, or, at any rate, if they are Confucians, as nothing without philosophy and a definite theory of life. In their eyes unbelievers and materialists are barbarians; and Christians, who were but bastard believers when their faith was a living thing, have now ceased to believe even in their own Prophet. No wonder then that some among us who think of to-morrow have

begun to talk of an Eastern peril: no wonder that the sword of peace has not penetrated the East when its twofold edge has been allowed to rust in our own hands.

The sword which the Prince of Peace came to bring into the world cuts both ways and is primarily intended for the most civil and civilizing of all purposes—war against our domestic enemies. As befits a militant organization like civilized Christendom, it may be held in reserve for military purposes, but its essential function is surgical—to remove redundant growths which interfere with the healthy development of the organism. Never, on the plea that there are no domestic enemies left to conquer, must it be allowed to rest in the scabbard. It must be always out and ready, in the hands of an authority that knows how to profit by experience, for "war against war." In a world like the present, domestic enemies cannot be entirely eliminated, but they can be repressed. Private greed and individual pride may be so restricted that they do not become chronic in the whole civic body nor superinduce a fever of international jealousy with its temperature at the fighting point.

That there is such a thing as being too proud to fight is only too true. It is also very natural; for a proud man has neither the discretion to see that his own pride is his worst enemy nor the courage to stand up against it. To do so would mean fighting against himself and he finds it simpler to fight someone else. Just because he has shirked the really decisive battle he finds himself in the position of the helpless bully, who is in the chronic necessity of having to knock down somebody.

To have been once knocked out by a benevolent hand is often a necessary preliminary to conquest. Such restraint, in a war against war, is the only substitute for self-restraint. St. Paul's career of moral conquest was fitly inaugurated by a good knock-down blow. Because he was down himself, he was able to lift up the world. He stooped to conquer, which is the only method of making conquest an acceptable and permanent thing. Certainly it is the only method which will give us a permanent footing in the East.

For even development, for steady and proportionate growth Christendom must expand under the sanction of a Christian theory of life enforced by a recognized spiritual authority. The militant spirit, when duly baptized and nurtured in grace, becomes stronger than before, but gradu-

ally changes the scope of its operations. It finds out its real enemies and has no time to fight the wrong ones. Its function is to know the strategy of the powers of darkness and to combat the insidious foes that always multiply as civilization advances. The more militant it becomes the less it will retain of militarism, and "We do want to fight and, by jingo, if we don't!" will be the refrain of peace on the lips of every redeemed chauvinist.

If militarism needs re-baptizing, pacifism needs it still more and, when both are well redeemed there will be little distinction between the two. They will, then, both be ready for the conquest of the East. If carnal weapons have to be used, the battle will be only an initial incident—the stricken field that reddens the dawning of a new era. But one thing is certain: Christianity was intended by its Founder to be an expanding organism. Its power of expansion is the measure of its vitality and, if our present Christian civilization loses this power, it is doomed to make way for another inheritor of its destiny.

Long before the Reformation a gradual differentiation between the functions of Church and State was going on as a result of natural and healthy development. There were fewer ecclesiastical warriors and fewer sacristan kings. It was only when the differentiation became a divorce that Christian civilization began to lose its character. The head of Christendom was invited to become a figure-head. Not only was he asked to mind his own business, which, in itself is a very reasonable request, but he was asked to do so on the assumption that he had no particular business worth minding. The world could go on without him: and it has gone on with surprising acceleration; so much so that men have begun to inquire, with wonder and alarm, in what direction it is going, whether to death by violence or death by moral disease, or—and it is here that Catholics are convinced that there is but one way out of the dilemma.

Christendom is staggering because, in a double sense, it has lost its head. The obvious remedy is to re-establish the head on the body. It is foolish to object that, when the head was in its place, the whole organism showed frequent signs of being wrong-headed, seeing that, before the severance it was still immature, and wrong-headedness is a common accompaniment of immaturity. At any rate the organism was a pulsating entity and not a collection of detached



limbs. Without violence to the metaphor we may say that both head and body have since developed independently, especially the former, so that it is not too late for reunion to take place. That the Holy See is the greatest moral power in the world is becoming more and more recognized. It is recognized implicitly even by its enemies, especially by those who make a parade of ignoring it and by those who are equally ready to undermine its influence and to blame it for not using its influence unasked. (That it has ceased to be a military power and is never likely to reassume its old military harness is equally recognized by friend and foe alike.) The march of events, as well as hierarchical development, has made it fantastically improbable that any successor of Pius XI. will ever seek to coerce a Christian monarch or a Christian nation in the particular manner in which Paul IV. sought to coerce Philip II. and his warlike Spaniards. As an agency for preserving the peace of the world the Papacy, if it has not enlarged its scope since the days of Innocent III., has greatly increased its inward efficiency. Its space for action has been restricted by a denial of the Faith on the part of some of its former children, which denial was, at the same time, an apostasy from the principles on which their civilization was originally built up; but the organic development of the Church both in the spiritual and in the administrative order, has gone on in spite of the defection of so many of her members. As far as her own vitality and her powers of adaptation are concerned, she is even more capable than before of taking up the spiritual government of the world.

Western civilization, on the other hand, having thrown off the control and guidance of its earlier days, has developed without a plan and has called up forces which are in danger of passing beyond all control. Yet its growth is a natural growth with the health and the maladies of fallen nature. The decline of civilization is not due to its complexity but to the fact that it is out of touch with the living principle which can unify its complications. The increasing recognition that a change of heart rather than a shifting of policy is needed to cure the evils of the world affords us some hope at least that Christendom is on the way to changing its heart by re-discovering its soul.

Among the natural results of advance in natural civilization is a growing recognition of the waste, futility and barbarism of war and, as a result of recent experience, it is

more than ever true that the majority of civilized people do not want war. Individually we are much more humanitarian than our mediæval ancestors. Still, we have not yet learnt that our machinery for keeping the peace,—secret diplomacy, treaties and armaments,—works all the other way. It is often said that if those who make war—politicians, journalists, financiers—had to man the front-line trenches, peace would be secure. The common folk—the vast majority—do not want to fight and only lose by fighting. War is no longer regarded as a healthy pastime: it is accepted as a necessary evil so that, under the guidance of a proper authority, public opinion may yet be gradually converted to the idea that the evil is altogether unnecessary. For such gradual change of heart the moral development of civilization must keep pace with its material growth: nationalism must be sublimated into a sentiment of loyalty to the family of Christian nations, and the commercial enterprise of every community must be so organized that the merchant shall be in some sense a missionary and the freighted ocean a highway for the transport of more than material goods, goods of the spirit that are freely given and thankfully received. In the modern world there are civilizations older than our own upon which the effect of our influence has been to render them dissatisfied with their conditions of life, without our having given them more than a feeble hint of how that life is to be regenerated. Intellectually we have tried to revive them with ephemeral creeds and philosophies already outworn or found experimentally dangerous at home. Unless we nourish them from the original sources of our own civilized life, every gift that we offer will come back to us in the form of a blow.

Christianity as a principle of regeneration is indestructible and communicates its indestructibility to nations that embody the Christian spirit. Napoleon recognized this truth and so does Signor Mussolini, though the former erred in not really trusting his ally, the Catholic Church, and in attempting to direct for his own private ends the moral and spiritual forces to which he appealed. The action of every leaven is modified by the character of the mass upon which it operates. The action of the Church upon the secular state, though never changing in its essential purpose, will become more and more complex in its outward manifestations as civilization advances. The more the functions of both be-

come differentiated the greater the need of harmony. Human institutions whether in the social or the political order are bound to fall to pieces unless, along with their complex development, there is a corresponding growth in the spiritual and moral sense. Law and order are on the downward grade when the guardians of the peace have no time for church-parade for, though checks and counter-checks may be necessary in a corporate body, the body itself is not a piece of clockwork, nor an engine that can be tinkered with spare fittings. It is a living entity, and, that the wounds and sores of society may be gradually healed, the currents of spiritual life must circulate through every member of the organism. Where the life-blood flows there is no evil so inveterate that it cannot gradually be eliminated, even the evil of war. Christian feeling, backed by common sense, has abolished the practice of duelling in England as well as among consistent Catholics in all parts of the world and, since there is no reason to assume that international war, as an institution for the settlement of quarrels, is more in harmony with human reason than the ordeal of battle between individuals, there is every reason to assume that the moral authority which has eliminated the one can also eliminate the other. A return to the authority of the Church is the one step whereby Christian civilization can return to itself and the only means it has to fulfil its destiny in the spiritual and moral conquest of the world. What with reviving hope within the fold and increasing pessimism outside, the issues are becoming clearer. The modern world is near the parting of the ways where the choice must be taken between authority and anarchy, between re-juvenation and senile decay.

JAMES KENDAL.

## CATHOLIC THEOLOGICAL COLLEGES AND PRESS DEFENCE

**T**HE object of the present writer being mainly to comment in the light of recent events on an article which appeared in *THE MONTH* four years ago, no apology is needed for quoting from it at some length.

In his article, entitled, "The Student and the Press,"<sup>1</sup>—a paper which had been read at the Catholic Conference on Higher Studies held at Cambridge the preceding Christmas week,—Mr. A. Hilliard Atteridge has the following:—

At the present day the people of England—Catholics as well as non-Catholics—do far more newspaper reading than book reading. . . . Amongst the centres of organized power and influence in England there are few, if any, that can rival the wonderful newspaper centre of London . . . a place where work hardly ceases day or night all through the year, except for the brief pause at Christmas. Every night it turns out newspapers—the great dailies—in millions of copies, papers that circulate all over the country. . . .

And all these newspapers find eager readers. Very few books reach a really large circulation. . . . Men *may* read books but they are absolutely certain to read newspapers, and to read them every day of their lives. The newspaper press supplies in our day most of the reading for the people—for the uneducated, half-educated and educated alike.

And let it be noted that the newspaper does not supply a mere colourless record of news. Facts and fictions bearing on the events of the day are published so as to influence opinion. They are carefully selected, skilfully marshalled, and emphasized with a deliberate purpose by the boldly displayed headline and the well-argued leading article or the brief explanatory comment. It is not only news that is dealt with. Religious, philosophical, scientific, historical, social topics are all handled. The newspaper reader gets his knowledge and his views on all the latest developments and activities in these various departments, largely, if not entirely, from his favourite daily paper. . . .

<sup>1</sup> *THE MONTH*, February, 1921.

For one man who has ever studied any scientific work on the evolution theory, there are a score who have got from newspaper reviews and articles the fixed belief that the evolution theory, in its extreme rationalistic form, represents the demonstrated and generally accepted result of half a century of scientific research. . . .

Now it is obvious that it would be a source of danger for Catholics to read regularly day by day books inspired by Indifferentism, Scepticism and Neo-Paganism. The situation is surely just as bad when the literature so read is not in book but in newspaper form. Yet under modern conditions newspaper reading has become practically a necessity of every day life.

I suggest, therefore, that we may well try to find some means of forearming our educated young men and women, and of preparing them, during the later years of their studies, in some way that will safeguard them from being *helplessly influenced* by the newspapers they will read when they leave the college for their life work. *I further suggest that it would be well worth while to give our clerical students and our teaching Sisters some definite knowledge and guidance that will prepare them for helping others in this matter.* (Italics ours.)

It is clear from the above quotations that Mr. Atteridge is concerned in his article not with Press Defence—broadly, supplying the Catholic corrective to evil influences at their source in the Press itself—but with providing an antidote to the Catholic reader exposed to such influences. Both these objects are of prime importance, and both, the first especially, have long exercised the minds of clergy and laity;<sup>1</sup> what if both objects can be attained, in great measure, by one and the same means? In order to show that they can, let me cite an excellent illustration furnished by Mr. Atteridge's own experience as a student of Catholic Philosophy, and then show from more recent experience how, in addition to the educational benefits claimed for the method he advocates, the purposes of Press Defence can be served also.

One day [we are told], which I even now remember as a day of special interest, the professor of Moral Philosophy, who was then dealing with the question of property

<sup>1</sup> Cf. articles on "Catholics and the Press," in *THE MONTH*, December, 1902 (Mr. Britten), May, 1922 (Mr. Poynter). Also, correspondence in *Catholic Gazette*, especially December, 1923, March, April, May, June, 1924.

in land, produced a copy of that morning's *Times*, and read us a leading article on the Irish Land Question. By the way, he was an Englishman, and his comments did not even touch upon party politics. He analysed its argument, he showed how it was based upon a false principle, he exposed its fallacies, he called attention to the dexterous way in which they were disguised. I felt we were up against the real thing; we were dealing with no extract from a professorial treatise, but with the kind of talk that was going on among men in the living world of our day, and learning something of the methods of current journalism. It was a most useful experience.

Now let us suppose that a professor, with a view to giving greater actuality to his work, puts before his class, or before an individual student, a newspaper report of some serious misrepresentation of the Church's teaching, and points out that the error is being widely spread; further, that to refute it in the same paper would provide an admirable opening for spreading the truth over an equal area. On someone undertaking to write a refutation, the professor then supplies him with notes and references and sets him to work. Finally he, or some other competent person, supervises the result, and corrects whatever may need correction in style or matter, so that the Catholic case may be presented with accuracy and force. Surely a theological student to whom this chance has been given has had "a most useful experience," because the living practical "objections" he has answered give him just that grip of Catholic dogma and its implications which the Scholastic method is designed to give; the very form in which the *Summa* is cast is eloquent testimony to the part which error can be forced to play in the service of truth, and if St. Thomas made such capital of the *Quaestiones Disputatae*, which vitally interested his own generation, it needs no effort of imagination to conceive what use he would make of the modern press. Further, had the Angelic Doctor to deal with English students to-day at an age when a Latin text-book is not absorbingly attractive, that very wise and very human saint would, by just some such means, make the dry bones to live.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The correspondence columns of the Anglican *Church Times* and *Guardian*, wherein earnest and often very learned men pursue indefatigably that elusive phantom, the creed of the Church of England, furnish an inexhaustible field of exercise for the budding theologian.



I have dwelt thus far on the value of such an experience to the student himself rather than on possible benefits which may accrue to Catholic Press Defence because the Church has ever regarded the education of her future priests as a matter of supreme importance: by the standard of its effect upon that preparation, every activity proposed for the time of study has to be judged, and it is that standard which I have striven to apply in estimating the results so far obtained.

There are, however, as I have hinted, other results outside the seminary to be considered. From the extremely interesting correspondence on Press Defence carried on in the *Catholic Gazette* last year, I should like to quote part of a letter contributed to the April number by his Lordship, the Bishop of Sebastopolis:—

Suppose a paper is published in some small town . . . containing a most virulent attack upon some point of Catholic doctrine . . . there is but one priest in the place. He has but little leisure, and what is more, his library is small and badly equipped, and though he is itching to cross swords with the Church's enemies, he feels it would be imprudent to do so. He may be fully able to offer a satisfactory solution to the difficulties *now actually before him*, but he is nervously conscious that others may easily be sprung upon him by an unscrupulous antagonist, which he would be unable to deal with. So he lets the matter drop. . . .

There is no doubt but that many an earnest defender of the Church (priest no less than layman) would be enormously encouraged and gratified, when entering the lists so soon as he becomes aware that he may seek and find assistance by writing to the P.D.L.<sup>1</sup> One is often drawn into controversy with no public library near which one can consult, and with no means of verifying the truth of statements made, or the degree of accuracy in the stories told, and on such occasions it would be a real God-send to have a body of learned men who, with very little trouble, could and would gladly lend their valuable aid and supply the information needed. . . .

The next (May) issue of the *Catholic Gazette* contained a letter from St. Beuno's College, signed *President*, announcing the formation there of a *Catholic Action Society*; the hope

<sup>1</sup> A possible *Press Defence League* with which his Lordship's letter is concerned.

is expressed "that the problem is in a fair way of being practically solved by a small body of anxious and zealous workers at this College, provided we can get the kind co-operation of others." In other words, a theological college proposed to meet exactly that need which his Lordship's letter indicated.

Unlike *President's* letter this article is entirely unofficial. I am expressing simply my own opinion when I say that *any* theological college has all the machinery for a "Press Defence League" ready made. I have read carefully everything I could find in Catholic papers on this subject, and have noted with admiration how keenly alive to the need and how zealous to meet it devoted laymen have shown themselves. Mr. J. W. Poynter, in particular, has long been occupied with a project of which, however, he writes in the *Catholic Gazette* for December, 1923, "The conclusion, then, is this: it has not now been found possible to form a Catholic Press Defence organization on the lines I suggested." Many similar suggestions have been made, but, as far as I am aware, without very definite result; the reason appears to be the practical difficulty of creating just that organization which, as I have said, exists ready-made in every seminary.

The account of the *St. Beuno's Catholic Action Society* given in the *Jesuit Directory* for 1925 tells us that, "the C.A.S. has the approbation and approval of His Eminence Cardinal Bourne and of His Grace the Archbishop of Cardiff, and it is their belief that it can do much to further the interests of the Church in England and Wales." Also that, "The courteous consideration which editors have so far shown us encourages us to believe that there is a great and fruitful field of activity open to us in this direction."

There is, if that field were to be cultivated, more fruit to be gathered than all the seminaries of England could succeed in gathering; but could not ten seminaries do ten times the work of one?

One last word to avoid misconception: any seminary that might signify, say through the Catholic Press, its willingness to take up the work would stand in much the same relation to other seminaries similarly engaged as, for instance, one diocesan *Evidence Guild* stands to another; each of these latter is dependent absolutely for its existence and for the conditions of such existence on its own ecclesiastical authority, and the need of co-ordination is sufficiently met

as a rule by an annual meeting of diocesan guilds. That much co-ordination the seminaries already possess in the *Catholic Conference on Higher Studies*, to which might be left such details of organization as the prevention of overlapping, the determination (possibly) of certain "districts" corresponding to provincial or diocesan divisions, and the co-operation to be sought from our indefatigable lay coadjutors. Indeed, the closer co-operation which would result between our future priests and the laity of their own dioceses would be no small gain in itself.

T. D. ROBERTS.

NOTE.—Apart from the vindication of Catholic doctrine and the refutation of calumnies against the faith, to be carried on in the daily and weekly press, there remains the wider field of co-operation with the Catholic Truth Society in the production of pamphlets. We are told, and indeed its most recent Catalogue betrays the fact, that it has not yet recovered the lee-way it lost in this respect during and after the war. There are many gaps in its doctrinal and expository, in its hagiographical, in its controversial, in its historical series. There is room for hundreds of brightly-written, clear, accurate, and interesting pamphlets which those engaged in ecclesiastical studies are competent to produce. And the experience of the C.A.S. hitherto has put beyond doubt that the Catholic Truth Society would welcome co-operation on these lines.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A suggestive list of *desiderata* in the way of pamphlets is to be found in *THE MONTH*, Dec. 1923, some of which, of course, have since been supplied.

## EASTERN *VERSUS* WESTERN MIND

NOT long ago the Prime Minister said to a number of journalists at dinner, that the visit of Mr. Purcell to Moscow reminded him how difficult it was for an Occidental to enter into the mind of an Oriental. He then quoted an incident in which Sir Henry Layard and the Wadhi of Mosul figured. Sir Henry wrote asking for information about the population and industries of Mosul, to which the Wadhi answered:

My illustrious friend and joy of my liver. The thing you ask of me is both difficult and useless. I have passed all my days in this place and I have neither counted the houses nor inquired into the number of its inhabitants, and as to what one person loads on his mules and the other stows in his ships that is no business of mine. But, above all, as to the previous history of this place, God only knows the amount of dirt and confusion that the infidels may have eaten before the coming of the Sword of Islam. It were unprofitable for us to inquire into it. . . . O my soul! O my lamb! Seek not after the things that concern thee not. Thou camest unto us and we welcomed thee. Go in peace.

"After this," added Mr. Baldwin, "follows the splendid phrase,"

After the fashion of thy people thou hast wandered from one place to another until thou art happy and content in none.

The grave consideration thus lightly touched upon, is pitilessly emphasized in an extraordinary book by M. René Guénon, "*Orient et Occident*" (Payot, Paris).<sup>1</sup> In a word, he holds the Orient to base its civilization (we put this in the singular because he considers it homogeneous in the last resort) on traditional metaphysical principles, whereas the West has abandoned principles altogether, and lives off material effort and sentiment. He thinks that an "entente" with the East, based on those principles, is the only way in which we may avoid complete disaster. Meanwhile, though all religion is, he holds, but a second best, he would gladly see Europe

<sup>1</sup> Here or elsewhere we have already spoken of his "*Introduction Générale à l'Etude des Doctrines Hindoues*," of his "*Erreur Spirite*," and of his "*Théosophisme: Histoire d'une Pseudo-Religion*."

re-Catholicized, since traditional Christianity was the nearest Western metaphysical and mystical approach to the ideal, indeed, the only one worth alluding to. I may be allowed to indicate his thesis as set forth in his latest book.

In his introduction he quotes the pessimist Kipling, "East is East and West is West," and though he sees that the Englishman may thus despond out of some consciousness that either his nation or he personally have "failed" in India, yet he, too, goes near confessing that "never the twain shall meet." Still, he insists that if only the West were not so *a priori* certain that it has nothing to learn from the East, a bridge might begin to be built. That M. Guénon can pile up references and document himself richly, his "Théosophisme" (as he rightly points out) can prove. This book, then, if it lies open to the criticism that it is a priorist and dogmatic, must not be taken as implying that he could not, if he wished, make it as learned as the most mole-like scholar might please. But he wishes, once more, to indicate principles and to turn the mind of his readers in the right direction.

This involves his indicating, in the first part of his book, what he calls "Illusions of the West." Looking at our western world quite generally, he sees it to be a "materialist civilization"—not using the former word in any strictly philosophical sense, but as implying that we pay enormous attention to material things—to coping with matter. Now wherever the centre of gravity is shifted to such things, there is, says he, a steady decline in the esteem of Mind, or shall I say, of Knowledge. For intelligence itself has come to mean (and Bergson seems to say, frankly, that it ought to mean) the faculty of making tools with which to make more tools. Not only intelligence is equated with reasoning, or rationalism if you will, but the aim of reasoning has come to be the production of the materially useful. Pragmatism has erected this collapse of the intelligence as a Truth-knowing faculty into a theory, and Truth itself is, if not denied, deemed undiscoverable. The modern world considers itself the heir of Greece. True, there was a space (it holds) of sleep, the Middle Ages, but in the sixteenth century men woke up again, resumed the Greek ideal of rationalism, and proceeded to apply reasoning to material complications. To the result, the name "civilization" has been applied. M. Guénon rather startlingly shows how young the word "civilization" is—*civiliser* can be found in the eighteenth century, *civilisation*

only in the economists of barely pre-revolutionary date. It entered the dictionary of the *Académie* only in 1835! Along with "Civilization," "Progress" is a word that has had a triumphant career in quite modern times. Indefinite Progress is a notion that seems first to emerge in Pascal. Bacon already regarded the "long ago" as the Youth of the World: but it was Pascal who, summing up all men as "Man," declared that man exists continuously and is "always learning." History proves nothing of the kind. Even material civilizations (to give them the name they never invented for themselves) have co-existed, the ones mounting, the others declining, and forgetting quite as much as they learned. M. Georges Foucart will have nothing of this infallible evolution of even one group, let alone of the totality, and that, I suppose, is why "comparative religionists" and sociologists so much dislike him. Dr. Schmidt, with his "cycles" of culture, proves the same, and to say that there is constant retrogression quite as much as progression, is to say that Progress is not a "law" at all. It is sheer assumption that if you take the world as a whole it regularly progresses, even though none of its parts do. M. Guénon admits, of course, that there are departmental scientific advances, in the sense that we *can* cope with matter in ways in which once we couldn't, and he even admits that allied to this is, or may be, a "moral" progress, in the sense that our feelings and preferences as to behaviour become more refined. But for this metaphysician, this is almost as bad, for since it cannot be shown that such refinement is due to any clearer perception of eternal principles, it has not, on the whole, much more value than a delicate nervous system has.

In the next two chapters he picks up the topics of The Science-Superstition, and of the Life-Superstition, and works them over in detail. He first concentrates on the hypnotic word "Science," which, for the West, has become all but a personification, along with Civilization, Liberty, and so forth. They are the deities of that "lay-religion" (preached not least, we may say, by his fellow-countrymen) which is, he truly says, a real "anti-religion."<sup>1</sup> This dates, he shows,

<sup>1</sup> A sort of parallel may be found in those cult-objects of the collapsing republican religion at Rome—Honor, Virtus, Fortuna Huiusce Diei. Cobwebs were veiling the altars of the hereditary gods, who had not yet received their new status from Augustus. A special study of the religious rôle of personified abstractions, in history, might be useful. Even within Christianity, and not least in France, there have been moments when "The Word" went as near ousting "Jesus Christ" as "Providence" has ousted "God" in England.



from the substitution of "free examination" and private judgment for all "traditional" religion—when M. Guénon uses the word "traditional" he always means something not discovered by individualist experiment merely, but that which flows necessarily from an eternal principle. Hence the logical growth of scepticism, and with it of theoretical toleration. All opinions should be respected since none can be known to be true. "Science" has this about it, that, alone of modern superstitions, it at least seems to repose on no base of sentimentalism, by which, again, M. Guénon means that most purely individualist affair, "feeling." A "scientist" plumes himself on never allowing personal impressions to dictate his conclusions. Yet in the concrete how often that is exactly what he does, and how confused are sweeping surmises with demonstrations, and how fiercely *intolerant* is normal Rationalism. Intellectualism having degenerated into rationalism, especially in the wake of Descartes, there have been reactions, as, the sentimentalism of Rousseau against the encyclopedists, the intuitionism of a Bergson, and pragmatism, in modern times. But even these refuse any real supremacy to the Intellect, and end in scepticism. The author hints that these views issue into results in the realms of politics and economics themselves, and may be consciously used therein by men of deeper insight. That such men admit that they know nothing beyond phenomena, and that the whole business of the mind is to deal with these, M. Guénon does not rebuke: but he fiercely rejects the claim that the unknown is the Unknowable. He does not seek to prove, here, that reasoning is not knowledge; but he rails at that substitution of the "Critique of Knowledge" for Knowledge.<sup>1</sup> I quite confess that he hints, on pages 52, 53, that there are not only fields of knowledge open to the Oriental mind and closed to ours, but faculties of knowing quite undeveloped here, but *there* made easy use of. We leave this for a moment. This modern despair of metaphysics issues into the attempt to make such generalizations as are yet possible out of departmental observations: hence the rise of specialists, men, says the author, "of an incredible *naïveté* the moment they get outside their due domain."<sup>2</sup> The higher the edifice erected

<sup>1</sup> Truth met Renan. "Thou hast argued cleverly about me, Renan. What reward wouldst thou?" "None but the having argued, Truth!"

<sup>2</sup> I should personally instance Sir Oliver Lodge, Sir J. G. Frazer, and Mr. Julian Huxley.

by a combination of such generalizations, the more it totters. The Orient, he maintains, is perfectly able, should it choose to do anything so uninteresting, to deduce all the inferior principles of modern sciences from its own transcendent, truly universal principles, and he illustrates this by comparing modern with ancient cosmologies, which never dreamed that the study of the visible universe could be a self-sufficient thing, but recognized that the universe not only depended on a principle beyond itself, but assuredly reflected, within itself, and on its plane, a totally higher order of existence. The result is that the materialist knowledge of the Western, shut up within the order of Contingencies, appears to the Eastern not to be worthy of the name of knowledge at all. Occidental Science appears to the Oriental just an ignorant informedness. In the following pages M. Guénon derides the outcome of all this. Modern science *suits* a materialist world: inventors are called "men of science": the results of science are telephones, aeroplanes. Moreover, the wiser among men of science, seeing that several hypotheses may account for the possibility of the material "invention," either sit lightly to their own hypotheses, and are quite prepared to see them superseded, and judge the value of a hypothesis by its applicability to some concrete stuff out of which they can make something (which is sheer scepticism, like Henri Poincaré's), or, the more vulgar sort believes blindly in the last hypothesis, preaches it, goes in for "popularization," and suffers from that itch to proselytize from which the East is immune. All popularization dilutes truth. It is not right to suppose that all men can, and therefore should, possess Truth. Therefore no wise man will so much as attempt to offer it to them. There is simply no excuse for the myth of human equality, mental or any other sort. Sheer ignorance is at worst negative: the sort of knowledge even of western science provided by popular handbooks imports a positive deformation of the mind. The Western is in fact the victim of a vast number of illusions into which he never peers: all his real activity is confined to memory-work—the amassing of "facts." Hence the desperation of the true Oriental when a Western thrusts himself in and proposes to "instruct" him. If the Eastern be sublimely arrogant (M. Guénon does not say this, nor could he, since real arrogance implies sentimentalism, and the vitiation of contemplative knowledge by an emotion—the con-

tempt of someone else interferes with the serene vision—but to us the Eastern may *seem* arrogant), the Western is childishly conceited. A Leibnitz will actually profess to interpret to the Chinese (who have forgotten it) the real meaning of their symbols! And one savant after another professes to *explain* in terms of modern criticism the origin, sense, and value of Oriental assets. All that such students can do, argues the author, is to show what becomes of Oriental truth when reduced to the level of such considerations. There has been but a transposition from one order of things to another, indefinitely lower.

M. Guénon has then a chapter on the modern "Life-Superstition" which is too valuable to condense. Along with those who are frankly "rationalist" are those who believe in a sort of "life-urge" which canonizes sheer change and calls it progress, just as it is apt to decry all stability as atrophy or even death. "Seek that you may *find*," has become meaningless for those who only seek for the sake of seeking, and a feverish activity has become preferred to peace in possession. Even introspection, he points out, reveals but phenomena: it is no better to envisage the world as instinct with a vital *élan* than to see it statically, if you remain with the world for object; indeed, sooner or later you collapse into that Sub-Conscious, the assigning of which as supreme is "the most incredible subversion of the natural order that the history of ideas has ever had to register" (p. 87). The practical outcome, says the author gravely enough, of this Philosophy of Becoming, this conception of Life as movement and change, this worship of Evolution as such, is, simply, the modern cult of pleasure, the inability to sit still, let alone to concentrate, the expansion of sentimentalism, then of sensationalism, finally of sensuality. In nobler souls, the elaboration of "ethics" may be a result, but of an ethic devoid of foundation and flowing from no eternal principle. So even ethics come to be the sum of behaviourist preferences, and religion itself is but a sort of sentimental halo cast about the momentary moralism. Words themselves cease to fulfil their function, since they float, in significance, with the floating mind, and there is no real reason to suppose that you understand what anyone is saying.

No wonder then that he seeks a *rapprochement* with the Orient. Bogeys beset the path. Might not the Orient destroy us? Far less probably than our own elaboration of de-

structive engines might. (Yet perhaps the disillusionment of our sentimentalism could usefully thrust us back to Intelligence. . . .) That it might *absorb* us is possible. We are a heterogeneous and assimilable crowd. Our methods of colonization, of "educating" the conquered, infuriate the Eastern. Or rather, provided we would but serve the East, so far as material equipment goes, and not interfere with its ideas, he would put up with us. M. Guénon dilates on the essential pacifism of the Chinese (and offers an explanation that we cannot test of the Boxer episode). He grants that Japan is a collective anomaly, but does not admit that the turbulent minority of Europeanized Indians affect in the least the soul of India. Panislamism will not hurt us unless we clumsily interfere with Mohammedan groups, which Bolshevism, he argues, will not win, since not only is it so strongly "managed" by Jews, whom Islam now detests, but Russia is not to be regarded, by now, as Asiatic in mentality.<sup>1</sup> If the East flirts with Moscow, it is because Moscow *may* help to evict the English. If the East did *not* combine against the English in the War, it was because the alternative was Germany—just as bad, *qua* Occidental.

Useless attempts at an *entente* have already been made. Sheer politeness demands that the initiative should come from the mushroom civilization of the West! But how? It should be a humble one—not proselytism. The Oriental does not need, or want us. Indeed, commercial development (which is what we offer) would only provoke new antagonisms. Humanitarianism (our option) is sentimentalist. And our very humanitarianism is, in practice, very "interested." As for Western science, research, and "philosophy," these ignore the essence of the Oriental mind: that mind, on its side, does not adapt itself to such things, because it finds them dull compared to its own Knowledge. It regards facts as no more than items: hypotheses, as playthings: Aristotelianism, even, as mere analysis and mathematics in the long run.<sup>2</sup> Especially a philosophy of *action* is despicable to an Oriental. Not that he disregards action as such—India allows for it, in such castes as are composed of men who "can

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps Russians are Asiatic enough in blood to make them unintelligible to both Teutons and Latins: but certainly any less metaphysical folks it would be hard to find. We hold they pass from one piece of impressionism to another, and live in the sphere of sensation, not even of rationalism.

<sup>2</sup> M. Guénon does not say this, but implies it. Moreover, that is what the Hindu does think of a syllogistic system.

no other." What of Religion? M. Guénon would like to see Catholicism restored in Europe (for it alone of cults has a metaphysic) but not exported. Why indeed should it be? The noblest religion has mixed some sentiment with its knowledge. Each religion is, on its plane, a due presentment of the Eternal Thing. Thus, though pure Hinduism is not in itself religious (though it can put on that aspect), a Hindu will readily seek to recall a European to the faith, and even explain it to him, without wishing to adopt it. For it is an indefinitely better expression of "tradition" than anything else amongst us. It cannot replace metaphysics, but is not incompatible with them. As for the modern criticism which rationalizes all religions, our own and the Eastern ones, M. Guénon simply laughs at it. It does not know even how to approach its subject. As for theosophism and occultism, he hates these apish charlatans. He begs therefore that an *élite* (for there is no democracy in things of the mind, if anywhere), should slowly toil towards that super-rational, nay, super-individualistic, intuitive, non-relative contemplation of first principles (or of *the* First Principle) where alone we may adequately meet. Our starting-point does not matter. Any of our assets will do. Each may be an occasion for progress and a "support" for our next platform. Hopeless task? No: for surely there are a few survivors from the mediæval world where there was more intercourse with the East than is supposed; and more, Christian and Mohammedan, who compose an inner circle of scholastics in possession of the true tradition. This *élite* (not a new group or organization, save accidentally) may affect the world the more powerfully because, precisely, it remains unmoved in the movement it originates. Even ten men in possession of first principles, will cause these to reflect themselves in all lower spheres of being and act, and prepare the *entente*, though not the fusion, between East and West. Thus may the Universe proceed to its perfect equilibrium.

Briefly. With M. Guénon's criticism of our materialist, sensationalist, therefore sceptical world, and his estimate of its chances along its present line, we agree. As to his view of the East, how can we judge the facts? Honour to men who, like PP. Johann, Dandoy, and one or two others (to keep to our acquaintance) are really trying to understand from within the Hindu philosophy of the world. On the whole, it is true that we do not know the East. Hence we

should say that much of our missionary effort (among the *intellectual* classes at any rate, for do we make any impression on Brahman, bonze or Sufi?) is wasted save in the hidden realm of God's uncovenanted graces. Prelates, simple catechists, contemptuous scholars and kindly non-Catholic observers have conspired to tell us so, and how should it be otherwise? Moreover, we are not in the least inclined to hasty reprobation. We easily see that by "non-being" the Hindu does not mean nothingness, nor by non-action, inertia. Natural theology has long accustomed us to the doctrine of Analogy, and to the Immutability of the infinite pure Act. We see at once how an Oriental can envisage his religion that seems to us grotesque if not vile, without seeing in it anything of the sort. We recognize how much, that now makes any concrete religion, will not exist "in heaven"—faith, to start with, or hope; and how union with God and, in Him, with all else, will transcend all individualism without destroying personality; how vision will annul all reasoning and possession dissipate all effort. Finally, how there will be no need of sacrament or sacramental, of symbol or of shadow. But we hold (with much else) that the Beatific Vision (which is really what M. Guénon urges us to get, though even so with a difference) is not obtainable by us co-naturally. And if we have perforce to reduce our view to a sentence, we say: The East seeks to obtain that Vision by natural means, and, failing, sinks to the squalors and real inertia and militarisms and cruelties and vices that we see there, and knows not how to rise: the post-Christian West does not even try for that Vision, though once it knew it could, and is collapsing accordingly to sub-human levels: Christianity teaches how to reach the Vision of God by supernatural means. True, M. Guénon would see in the very name "God" a "form," tinged therefore with that transitory and illusory thing "sentiment." We cannot argue that: but we hold that our triple distinction remains valid, and that we ought to try to understand alike metaphysical East and pragmatic West by means of it.

C. C. MARTINDALE.



## "NATIONAL CHURCHES"

THE "Christian East," described as "a quarterly review devoted to the study of the Eastern Churches," published in two recent numbers (September and December, 1924) articles by Professor Nicholas Glubokovsky dealing with the papacy in relation to the Orthodox Churches.

Nothing could be more instructive than the appearance of an article by a leading Orthodox theologian attacking Roman claims in the same issue which contains an account of the Anglo-Catholic Pilgrimage to Palestine. A few quotations from the last-mentioned article will serve to show how far the fraternization of Anglican and Greek is proceeding.

A dismissal service, unique in the annals of the Anglican Communion, was held on the eve of the pilgrimage at All Saints', Margaret Street, when the Bishop of Willesden blessed and distributed the Scallop Shells marked with a red cross, the emblem of St. George, while Mgr. Germanos, Metropolitan of Thyateira, hallowed the ikon of repoussé silver work, very beautifully and cunningly designed by Mr. Omar Ramsden, representing St. George and the Dragon, a gift to the Patriarch of Jerusalem for the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The Bishop of Nassau, president of the pilgrimage, sang the Itinerary, and then the pilgrims themselves were blessed, first by the Greek Metropolitan and then by the Bishop of Willesden. The Bishop of Nebraska, representing the Episcopal Church of America, himself a pilgrim, was also present in the sanctuary.<sup>1</sup>

From the time when the arrival of the pilgrims at Alexandria was greeted by "a throng of Archimandrites and Priests in gorgeous array," the pilgrimage is one long story of blessings and incensings on the part of the Orthodox, responded to by Anglican addresses and speeches of extraordinary warmth. No wonder the Anglicans were genuinely moved, for consider what it meant for a bishop, to whom some even of his own colleagues in England would deny any particular sacerdotal powers, to find himself in the atmosphere of an Eastern Church where he was "met by the

<sup>1</sup> "Christian East," p. 98. A similar service held on April 26th this year is described in *The Times* for the following day.

Vicar of the Armenian Bishop, invested with a cope and a great mitre much bejewelled, given a pastoral staff and a small hand cross, and then led to the High Altar, which he was invited to cense, and afterwards gave the pontifical blessing." (p. 99.) We find the same colonial bishop "saying Mass" in Greek vestments before the Orthodox Metropolitan in his own chapel, and the forty-five priests of the pilgrimage using Orthodox churches freely for the same purpose.

The following quotation from an Anglican address to His Beatitude Cyril, Patriarch of the Coptic Church, strikes the keynote of the whole series of complimentary effusions, English and Eastern:—

As a national Church, like your own, it has never been, and never could be, our wish that members of your Communion should transfer their allegiance to ours, or that your order and worship should be assimilated to Anglican models, any more than that Anglicanism should adopt the customs of the East. We believe, rather, that in the re-united Christendom of our vision and prayers, the amplest room will be found for every national characteristic and distinctive feature by which national Churches can best glorify the One Lord. (p. 120.)

Now, as a matter of fact, the *single point* in which the Anglicans and Orthodox really do attain a measure of practical unity is opposition to Rome. Prescinding altogether from the regrettable incident at the Basilica of Bethlehem, which led to a somewhat inconclusive controversy in *The Tablet* of last May, Rome is hardly ever mentioned in these pages but as an object of attack, sometimes not less misleading than bitter. To the Latin Patriarch, we are told, "any infringement of the 'status quo' . . . is an article of almost equal importance to any in the 'Credo.'" (p. 102.) If there are only 65,000 Christians in Palestine to 500,000 Moslems, again it is the fault of the Latins, "who might have employed their time better than in squabbling over the 'status quo,' unless, indeed, they have lost all Apostolic fervour and regard the conversion of Moslems as hopeless!" (p. 105.) No hint here of the real reason why the Latin authorities—and the *responsible* British ones, too—have to exercise such care in maintaining the *status quo*; no recognition of Catholic missionary labours among Moslems, which have won the admiration of the world, and no word of the

missionary stagnancy in the Orthodox churches deplored even by their own clergy.

Turning now to the article by Professor Glubokovsky, one of the most moderate of Orthodox theologians, the Eastern Schism of the eleventh century is described in terms of "the monstrous arrogance of the Papal Legates," of the Pope "*usurping* the divine authority over the whole Church," of the "hierarchic self-exaltation" of the Papacy, making it "an impassable barrier of division." (p. 127.) That is the language of respect compared to more typical expressions of Orthodox opinion, which, as space does not permit us to cite examples here, can only be described as resembling the English seventeenth century view of Rome as the Scarlet Woman. This is not surprising, for the Eastern Churches have won their "national independence" of Rome at the cost of an Erastian subservience to the State and their views of the Universal Church have been manufactured and imposed by their respective Governments for State purposes.

We have mentioned the Eastern Schism, not because Professor Glubokovsky has anything new to say on the subject, but rather because the very fact of his simply repeating statements, made and answered hundreds of times already, shows that no advance is likely to be made so long as Greeks and Anglicans hold to their present claims on behalf of *national churches*. The address we have quoted from twentieth century Anglicans to Greeks glorying in the *national* character of their churches is exactly the spirit which prompted the twenty-eighth Canon of Chalcedon, against which in the fifth century St. Leo protested with such vehemence, as though he had indeed foreseen the logical consequences of such a spirit in Photius two centuries later, or in Henry Tudor after ten. "*Alia tamen ratio est rerum sæcularium, alia divinarum,*"<sup>1</sup> was St. Leo's answer to the proposals of the twenty-eighth Canon to exalt Constantinople at the expense of Alexandria and Antioch *solely* on account of its secular dignity derived from the emperor.<sup>2</sup> As Father Rivington points out in "The Primitive Church and the See of Peter," the attack on the constitution of the Church which culminated in the Eastern Schism began when some 150 Eastern bishops out of the 600 (approximately) who had already finished the real business of the Council, met without

<sup>1</sup> "Divine and secular things have quite distinct principles."

<sup>2</sup> Leo, Epistula 104 ad Marcianum Augustum 22 Maii 452.

their Presidents, the Papal Legates, and asserted a claim on behalf of Constantinople which thus far had been successfully resisted. An excellent opportunity for this *démarche* was afforded by the fact that, of the three patriarchates rivaling Constantinople, the chief (Alexandria) was vacant, while Maximus of Antioch and Juvenal of Jerusalem had in their own past the best of reasons for conceding everything possible at the moment to Constantinople. True, the twenty-eighth Canon was not aimed at the Roman Primacy over the whole Church *jure divino*, else there would have been no sense in seeking for it the approval of Leo, who, as they and everybody knew, claimed such a primacy; but by throwing so much stress even on an equality of patriarchal privileges on account of the new *secular* greatness of Constantinople, they paved the way for Photius who, in the ninth century, claimed for Constantinople *everything* which Rome had enjoyed, on the ground that seat of empire not the apostolic succession was the source of episcopal rights and dignities. The supreme secular power, by moving its capital, moved the centre of the Church's unity—that, at least was the idea. In point of fact only the Eastern Churches within the power of Constantinople acquiesced in this denial of St. Peter's claim, and as the course of political changes multiplied independent secular principalities, so the Eastern Church has fallen into corresponding divisions with little in common save subordination to the secular power.<sup>1</sup> In 1920 these sixteen Orthodox Churches nominally united under the Patriarch of Constantinople were quite independent and separate in organization: although certain differences both of doctrine and discipline divide them, chiefly on points connected with Transubstantiation, Purgatory, and the Immaculate Conception,

the real obstacle to reunion does not lie there, but in the intensity of racial and national antipathy, which the tradition and sufferings of centuries have maintained at the highest pitch. In the East nationality and religion are identified, and throughout the long struggle of its nations, whether with the tyrant at Constantinople or with one another, priest and people, nation and Church have ever been one. To adopt any other religion but the

<sup>1</sup> See Fortescue, "Orthodox Eastern Church," and for latest developments "Orientalia Christiana" (published by the Pontifical Oriental Institute) for January—March, 1924.

national one is to become a foreigner; to change one's rite is equivalent to changing one's nationality. That is why the Government of Greece, to prevent the growth of the Uniate Church, has made a change of rite compulsory on all converts to Rome. Elsewhere—and there are Uniate Churches side by side with the Orthodox Churches everywhere except in Russia, where persecution has exterminated them—Uniates change neither their rite, their customs, nor their nationality, but simply profess on conversion principles of Orthodox faith which before were implicit and unconscious.<sup>1</sup>

It is not unnatural then that the "monstrous arrogance" and "awful intolerance and severity"<sup>2</sup> of Rome should bring Anglicans and Orthodox together in defence of the nationalistic element common to both. If, as we believe, that "intolerance" is not disregard for legitimate national aspirations but the assertion of a true claim to be the divinely-appointed centre of unity, then Catholics must study every means by which our separated brethren can be set upon the Romeward road. Nowhere have these means been more successfully studied and applied than in Rome itself, where, under the Sovereign Pontiff's own guidance, the ablest scholars of the Universal Church are striving with Christlike charity to realize Christ's ideal of unity: never before, perhaps, has that ideal found nobler expression than in the aims and methods of the Oriental Institute<sup>3</sup> which, to judge from its latest publications, is largely concerned at present with bringing home to the separated nations the terrible effects of their isolation.

To appreciate something of those effects in Russia with its reputed population of 100,000,000 Orthodox faithful, we must try to realize, difficult as it is, the extent to which, for centuries past, nationality and religion have been identified in that country. The claims of Constantinople to become the New Rome passed, on the fall of that city in 1453, to Moscow where the Muscovites placed the centre of imperial unity, until such time as it should be restored under Slav auspices to Constantinople.<sup>4</sup> Then would that city become, according to Slav dreams, the centre of a world empire in-

<sup>1</sup> "The Problem of Reunion," by L. J. Walker, S.J., pp. 31-2.

<sup>2</sup> "Christian East," September, 1924, p. 127.

<sup>3</sup> For an account of the Oriental Institute, see *THE MONTH*, January, 1924.

<sup>4</sup> D'Herbigny, "Separated Eastern Churches," in "The Papacy" (Cambridge Summer School).

cluding Rome itself. Hence the rôle of the Russian Tsars as supreme heads of the Church, with vital control of the episcopate, councils and synods, as absolute rulers in the spiritual and in the temporal spheres as was the Imperial "Pontifex Maximus" of pre-Christian Rome. The double-headed eagle of the Russian standard symbolizes Russian rights over the two Empires, old Rome as well as new Rome, with a "divine mission" to control the world from Constantinople.

Religion is for them [the Russians] one and the same thing as patriotism. "To be Russian is to be Orthodox," wrote the exiled Archbishop Anastasius, in a mandate he addressed from Constantinople to other Russian *émigrés*, March 25, 1922. To be Russian is to be Orthodox. Consequently Russians who became Catholics were branded as traitors to their country, even though they had fought like heroes in the imperial cause. This same formula is heard in Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria and Roumania; to be Greek, Serb, Bulgar or Roumanian is to be Orthodox. . . . Religion is identified with nationalism to a degree well-nigh absolute. Dogma is quite a secondary consideration, nearly or wholly a matter of indifference. In Russia alone it is still discussed; among the lower classes it is believed in a childlike fashion, yet reverent withal. Elsewhere it is utterly neglected even by the clergy and the hierarchy. Were the Faith one and the same in two distinct ethnical groups, these Orthodox folk, on the first appearance of a national rivalry, would none-the-less proceed at once to excommunicate each other. Such indeed has been the case with Bulgaria, riddled with anathemas for fifty years past by the Phanar of Constantinople, because, following in the wake of Russians, Hellenes, Serbs and Roumanians, she has proclaimed her religious autonomy, or, as the Easterns say, her autocephalous rights.<sup>1</sup>

Since the Bolshevik Revolution, this vast political system lies a heap of ruins: Russian Christianity was bound up with it, and therein lies the tragedy. The Bolsheviks are the avowed enemies of Christianity, as eager to make Russia the centre of a pagan world-empire as were the Tsars to become rulers of an Orthodox Christian empire: with this end in view, they have not only fought Christianity directly by

<sup>1</sup> D'Herbigny in "The Papacy," pp. 72 and 73.



persecution and by a truly diabolical cult of pagan immorality especially in the schools,<sup>1</sup> but they are trying to harness the Orthodox Church to their chariot. The millions of simple peasants are attached to "Christian superstition" and to the Church of their fathers. Well, that Church, which was governed by the Tsars together with the State, will now be the Church of Lenin and Trotsky, the Red or Bolshevik Church. "It is certain, unfortunately, that the Red Church has gained over many Orthodox Christians, and it is greatly to be feared that millions will fall gradually under its influence. There is no reason, indeed, why it should not become the national Church in Russia."<sup>2</sup>

That the national Church in Russia serves all too easily the purposes of the new Government is not surprising when we consider the condition to which the clergy had been reduced by centuries of State domination. Not only were the bishops Government nominees appointed for their political not their religious qualifications, but the lower clergy

recruited as they were almost exclusively and under pressure from among the sons of priests, who up to the last quarter of the nineteenth century had neither the right nor the opportunity to choose any other career, the "white" or parochial clergy comprised numbers of men who were exasperated at finding themselves forced to take Holy Orders, which to them and to the public at large constituted a contemptible profession, ill-famed, and supplying an income wholly insufficient to save the priest and his family from beggary. From youth upwards they held in detestation a "calling" from which they could not escape, but which they thought would dishonour them for ever.<sup>3</sup>

The pan-Russian Council of Red "Churches" assembled in May, 1923, and numbering 62 bishops with 414 others not only made the Soviet cause its own, but showed how faithfully it reflected the "national characteristics and distinctive features" on which Anglicans dwell so complacently: thus, in deposing the Patriarch Tykhon, the Council declares in its

<sup>1</sup> See "L'Ame Religieuse des Russes"; "Orientalia Christiana," September—November, 1924.

<sup>2</sup> *The Times*: art. "Russia To-day" (June, 1923), quoted in "The Papacy," p. 82.

<sup>3</sup> "The Papacy," p. 79.

official manifesto<sup>1</sup> that, because the Patriarch has, among other crimes, headed the counter-revolution against the Soviets, the *Council*, which has ever been above all patriarchs, declares him deposed—an instructive commentary on the Conciliar Theory. It is to be noted that the Patriarch Gregory VII. of Constantinople not only approved the acts of this council in an "œcumenical synod" held on May 6th, 1924, but sent as one of his representatives to Moscow the same Metropolitan Germanos of Thyatira, who has been so warmly welcomed in England as notably "liberal" and "broad-minded" in his attitude to Anglicans of every school. Bad as this is, ignorance may excuse Anglicans in part: not so in the case of American Protestantism, which has not only been pouring millions of dollars into Russia<sup>2</sup> for the "conversion" of the Slavs but sent three bishops of the Episcopal Methodist Church to take part in the Red Council.<sup>3</sup> Copies of the "Social Creed" of these Methodists had been circulated among the "Red" clergy beforehand, and, although it made no mention of God or Jesus Christ, the whole Council rose and acclaimed "Bishop" Blake; his address dwelt on "one hope, one faith, one baptism," on "new discoveries" in conflict with the ancient teaching of the Church and the necessity of "re-statement."<sup>4</sup> One upshot of the Council was the foundation of a seminary in Moscow under Soviet auspices, where an American "Modern Churchman" is Professor of Orthodox Moral Theology. "Bishop" Blake's address on the ideal new Christianity was spoken five weeks after the murder of Mgr. Budkiewicz—no isolated event, but one of a long series of acts proving such an intensity of Bolshevik hatred against Rome as would be incredible had we not unimpeachable testimony.<sup>5</sup>

Out of evil, as usual, God's Providence has drawn good. In order to escape out of a land, which, it is no exaggeration to say, Satan seems to have made the centre of his kingdom upon earth, many thousands of Russian Orthodox have fled to the West and are learning to associate for the first time the Reign of Christ with the Unity of His Church. The following words of a Russian exile in Serbia<sup>6</sup> evince the fact that

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in "L'Âme Religieuse des Russes," p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Methodist publications quoted in "The Papacy," p. 61.

<sup>3</sup> "L'Âme Religieuse des Russes," p. 27.

<sup>4</sup> American "Christian Advocate," Vol. XCVIII., p. 717. Also New York *Evening Mail*, January 19th, 1923.

<sup>5</sup> "L'Âme Religieuse des Russes," pp. 30-32 and *passim*.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 113.

the agony of Christians in Russia has not been in vain: "All this" (the contrast between the National Churches of the East and the Universal Church) "is overwhelming evidence that the union of the two Churches . . . must be brought about, and that, each keeping its own rite, they must be united in common recognition of the sovereignty of the successors of St. Peter."

So is the prophecy of Pope St. Leo the Great in the fifth century being fulfilled in the twentieth: "He loses what he has, who covets what is not his due. There is one ordinance governing things temporal, another for things divine; nor shall any building be stable except (it be built upon) that rock which the Lord made His foundation."<sup>1</sup>

Before these lines are in print the second "Anglo-Catholic" Pilgrimage will have started for the Holy Land, to repeat, no doubt, in broad outline the experiences of last year, and to emphasize once more that it represents, or claims to represent, a "national" Church visiting other "national" Churches. To see how completely these earnest men, having lost belief in the Unity of the Church, have discarded her Catholicity as well, and by erecting national and racial barriers between Christians, have returned to the conceptions of Judaism, we need only recall St. Paul's claim for Christianity that it obliterates all distinctions not only of race and nationality but of sex and condition in the mystical Body of Christ.<sup>2</sup>

CYRIL CHARLIER.

<sup>1</sup> Ep. 104, ad Marcianum Augustum, 22nd May, 452.

<sup>2</sup> Gal. iii. 28: Col. iii. 11.

## A DISMAL CREED

**I**T is becoming quite the fashion nowadays, in certain circles, to affect a sort of Neo-Buddhism, and believe in Re-incarnation.

But it is one thing to hold this doctrine as a dilettante speculation in a country that has been Christianized for more than a millenium, and quite another to be brought up from infancy in an environment which has been saturated with it for thousands of years. It is doubtless very sweet and touching that Edwin and Angelina should gaze soulfully into each other's eyes, in some West-end drawing-room, and *feel* such intense spiritual affinity that they "are sure" they must have known each other in some former existence (very probably in Egypt, which seems for some reason or other to be the favourite place for these rendezvous); but it would be a very different thing for Edwin if, as a result of his beliefs, he was never allowed to have a bath; or for Angelina if she thought—in order to acquire merit—it was the proper thing to pay a beggar to sleep in a place infested with vermin—for the sake of the vermin—for whose sake, also, by the way, Edwin would have to forego the luxury of his daily ablutions. Yet this is the way things work out amongst certain of the strictest devotees in the Jain Sect in India.

Far be it from me, however, to say a word in scorn against the Jains. I have many personal friends amongst them (including Mahatma Gandhi), and cherish an infinitely greater respect for the conscientious Hindu than it is possible to feel for such persons as European Theosophists, who pretend to be Buddhists and Christians at the same time.

It was my privilege, when I was in India, to be introduced to a very cultured family of Jains, consisting of a widow and her two elegant and accomplished daughters. Both of the latter, by the way, had passed the Bombay Matriculation Examination, one of them with honours. This lady was exceedingly zealous in the practice of her religion, and used to go a considerable distance every day to pay her devotions at a magnificent Jain temple, whither she was generally accompanied by one or both of her daughters. The rest of this article is a description of the visit I paid to her house, and of the conversation—as accurately as I could write it down immediately afterwards—which took place while I was there.

On arriving, I was led by a servant through the bungalow to a spacious veranda on the far side of the house, where I was soon joined by my hostess and one of her daughters. As a concession to the weakness of the flesh (or to put it more accurately, the stiffness of my European joints) I was given a chair to sit on. My hostess, to keep me in countenance, accommodated herself in like manner, though I am quite sure she would have felt much more at her ease sitting on the carpet in the ordinary Eastern fashion.

It was a beautiful, still evening, and the view from the veranda was magnificent. The indescribable colours of an Eastern sunset were reflected in the waters of the broad river by which the house was situated; they shone also, with no less beauty on a stately palace on our right, which had been built many years ago by long-forgotten Mohammedan kings.

Tea was brought in, and we talked for a while on subjects of general interest: the long-delayed rains, the prospect of famine, the Government, and the inevitable Mr. Gandhi and his Non-co-operation Movement.

It was a very close evening, and innumerable flies buzzed about in the windless air. One of these seemed to have singled me out for its especial victim, and kept annoying me in a most pertinacious manner. After I had flicked it away from my face for about the fourth time in one minute, in desperation I made a snatch at it, as it returned once again to the onset. My hostess eyed me critically. "I suppose," I remarked—thinking it would be a suitable transition to the subject I had come to discuss—"I suppose you would think it very dreadful of me if I were to have killed that fly." "Well, *we* wouldn't do it," she replied seriously and with unmistakable emphasis. "You believe it might have been a man in a former life, don't you?" I went on.

"Yes," she replied, "it might, or it might have been a plant, or an animal; in fact any living thing. I suppose you don't think so," she added with a smile.

"No," I replied, "we don't think so, and it is hard for us to understand how you do. Don't you think there is a great difference between the soul of a man and the soul of a fly—if a fly *has* a soul at all?"

"There is a difference, of course," she replied, "in so far as a man knows more; but the essence of his soul—the innermost principle of life—is the same in both cases, and in all cases. Hence the first principle in our Jain Religion is the Doctrine of Ahinsa—or Harmlessness,—the holding

sacred all forms of life. For it is the same life, in its essence, in all living things. And therefore we regard it as a sin, willingly to take the life of any creature."

"The soul," she went on, "can be compared to pure gold, hidden in an ore. It has to go through a long period of purification before it is perfected, until it is freed from all the dross of the baser metals. For this purpose it has to go through an infinite number of different bodily forms. It may, for instance, take the form of a tree, and for many years endure the buffeting of wind and weather, till at last it suffers under the wood-cutter's axe: or it may come as a bird, or a tiger, or a fly—or as a man. But always it is the same soul. So therefore we refrain from taking life as far as it is possible."

At this point my hostess drew my attention to the neighbouring bungalow—a palatial erection—the home of a very wealthy Jain manufacturer. "The gentleman who lives in that house is a very orthodox Jain—much more so than we are. In his house no one—including children and servants—is allowed to eat or drink between sunset and sunrise."

"Why is that?" I asked.

"Lest they might accidentally swallow, and so kill, any small insects that have settled on their food or drink."

"I am glad I don't live there," I replied, laughing, "especially in the hot season," I added; at which my hostess smiled tolerantly.

Soon after this the conversation turned to the subject of the Jain temples, many of which are very beautiful. In answer to my inquiry, my hostess informed me that regular services are not as a rule held in these places, but that each person goes there to pray, whenever he feels inclined to do so. Several times previous to this I had visited Jain temples; and, as I had watched the devotees bowing down in front of the various images with their jewelled eyes, I had wondered very much what was going on in their minds. "And to whom do you pray?" I asked, "when you go to your temples—to God I suppose." It seemed to me rather a futile question once I had made it, for the answer to it seemed so obvious. Therefore I was rather surprised when the lady replied, "Oh, no, we never pray to God. God is a part of ourselves. We pray to the twenty-four founders of the Jain Religion, especially to Mahavia, the last one."

"Then you do not think God loves us, as a father loves his children," I went on.



"No," she replied, "God is altogether above such emotions as love and hate. He is impersonal."

"And you do not think it is *our* duty to love God?"

"No," she replied again, "we must cease to feel any love to God or to anyone else before we attain to perfection. Love is a form of desire; it is a limitation; we must learn to outgrow all such emotions."

"But," I broke in, "is not the love for great and noble persons—like your Mahavia for instance—a great stimulus for us to become better and nobler ourselves?"

"Most certainly," she answered, "the love for such persons helps us *for a while*—at the beginning of the Path. But we must give it up before we reach the end. Love is like a carriage which brings us to the door of the palace; but we must leave the carriage outside before we can enter through the portals. We must cease to feel any affections before we are ready to enter in."

"I am afraid I am very stupid," I said, "and perhaps a little stubborn, but I do not yet see why Love should be locked out. Is it not the thing we prize most, more than health or riches or even fame? We have a saying that it is 'Love which makes the world go round.'"

"That's just it," she replied, "love leads to action, and action makes more Karma (which is the second great doctrine of our religion). And Karma brings re-birth into the ceaseless round of earth-lives, which is the very thing from which we want to escape."

"It is true," I answered, "that love leads to action; but what other joys are equal to the willing service of love?"

"Here on earth that is so," she replied, "but if love brings us our greatest joys, it is also the cause of our deepest sorrows. For love must end in separation, as surely as the night follows the day. The more you love anyone the greater is the dread of the separation which must inevitably follow, and the more terrible that separation when it comes."

"But do you not expect to meet your friends again in the future, after death?"

"There is practically no chance of that," she answered sadly, "once death has intervened, for the paths of the lives of different souls are so infinitely varied that they are never likely to meet again."

The note of sadness in the lady's voice, as she enunciated this melancholy dogma, seemed to me the more pathetic as

I recalled to mind what I had been told with regard to her previous history. Her husband, to whom she had been devotedly attached, had died some eight years before this time. Since his death she had divided her time between the practice of her religion and the care for her two daughters, for whom she did her utmost to procure the best education. Considering she had sustained so heavy a bereavement with nothing more to rely on than the negative consolations of such a faith, it was no wonder, I thought, that there should have settled on the lady's face an expression of almost habitual melancholy. Yet it was a noble melancholy, an expression of true resignation. There did not seem to be a trace of bitterness, resentment or scorn in those calm and dignified features, though they had been set, day after day, and year after year, against a destiny so bleak and cheerless.

I have observed, amongst the Jains, that when a member of the family dies—however much he may have been loved and admired—he is seldom or never referred to again by his relatives in conversation. And believing as they do, it is the most reasonable attitude to adopt. For what is the use of harrowing the soul by causing to vibrate in it memories which, in proportion as they are dear and tender, must torment it with longings as hopeless and "wild with all regret." Remembering this I made no allusion to the deceased member of the family, of whom I felt sure my hostess was thinking, but I went on something as follows: "Supposing, however, that, after all, God's nature was in a sense personal, and that He loves us individually, because His very nature is Love. Then all true and noble love between human beings would be, in some sort, a reflection or emanation of His Divine Love, and as such—though occurring in time—would have in it something of His eternal nature. And this would be a sort of guarantee to us that—even if we were separated by death from our beloved ones—we could look forward with some confidence to meeting them again in some other part of God's Universe."

The lady smiled tolerantly and rather wistfully. "Yes, *supposing* all that to be so," she said, "but it is a very big 'suppose,' isn't it? *Too* big, in fact! for by its very nature love belongs to this world of fleeting illusions; and like all such must eventually pass away."

"In other words," I said, referring to her former simile, "there is no other way of doing it, we must 'leave the car-

riage outside' if we are to enter into the Palace of Eternity?"

At this she nodded her head slightly as though to express her agreement, said nothing, however, but turned to gaze across the great expanse of river with a far-away expression that I could not fathom.

The darkness had come swiftly down on our talk. Lights had begun to twinkle, here and there, along the river bank; bats were flitting swiftly and obliquely in and out amongst the veranda pillars; and stars were beginning to twinkle in the deep purple sky. So I rose, thanked my hostess for her kind hospitality and her patience in answering my questions, and having made my salaams, took my departure.

As the car made its way through the uneven streets of the crowded bazaars, dodging the usual goats, children and wandering cattle, my mind brooded ceaselessly over my late conversation. It seemed a terrible thing that thousands and even millions of people should be brought up to such a cold and cheerless belief. The very thought of it weighed upon my soul, oppressing it with a weight as of piled mountains. The unspeakable tragedy of it all! Here, certainly, death had its sting, and the grave its victory.

I thanked God that I had been brought up amongst brighter hopes and clearer revelations. I thought of the noble words of Wordsworth, where he speaks of that "primal sympathy which, having been, must ever be." I thought of Shakespeare's brave sonnet: "Let me not to the marriage of true minds admit impediments"—in praise of that love which "bears it out even to the edge of doom." But most of all I thought of that redeeming and triumphant love, which is the basis of all our hopes for this life and the next.

I confess there was a time—before I went to India—when I was strongly attracted to the doctrine of Re-incarnation, and used to imagine that it could somehow be reconciled to the Christian cosmogony (I even read a book to that effect by "A Clergyman of the Church of England"). But after seeing this doctrine in practice I quickly relinquished all desire for any such a reconciliation—quite apart from its intrinsic impossibility—and now, when people ask me (like the Clown in "Twelfth Night"), "What is your opinion of the doctrine of Pythagoras?" I reply in the words of Malvolio: "I think nobly of the soul, and no way approve his opinion."

MORTIMER STANDING.

# MISCELLANEA

## I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

### PROTESTANTISM ON ITS DEFENCE.

IT was with a certain feeling of wonder that a Catholic assisted at the Great United Demonstration, organized by the World's Evangelical Alliance and held at the Albert Hall on March 31st 'to uphold the principles of the Reformation.' The speakers were both Anglican and Nonconformist, and the audience was drawn from the same two sections of Protestantism. The immediate occasion of the meeting was the proposed revision of the Prayer-Book, regarded seemingly as the common heritage of all varieties of religion sprung from the Reformation, but the conduct of that section of Anglicans which calls itself "Anglo-Catholic" came in for severe animadversion because of its supposed neglect of the Bible "as the supreme authority in all matters of Faith and practice," and its "sacerdotal pretensions." On the other hand, the conduct of those Anglicans who rank the latest text-book of Science as a more supreme authority than the Bible passed wholly unnoticed by these zealous men. They passed various resolutions affirming "unwavering devotion to the great Protestant principles of the Reformation," explicitly mentioning that principle which condemns their Protestantism as mere self-assertive intolerance, *i.e.*, "the right and duty of private judgment, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, in all that pertains to faith and conscience." Why should the poor "Anglo-Catholic," or for that matter, the very "Modern Churchman," be denied that right and duty by their Evangelical brethren?

But the wonder grew as the evening wore on. Here in the heart of Protestant London, where the "Reformed" religion had ruled for centuries, granting tolerance to the despised Papist a hundred years ago out of mere contempt for his impotence and scanty numbers, here was this great State Church, which had held all the stolen wealth of Catholics for three and a half centuries, had permeated every branch of public life, and been backed by the *prestige* of a mighty Empire, become mighty, so it claims, through its principles, calling in these last days upon the Dissenters to help it to revive a dying Protestantism. The same vast hall was filled last July by a still larger number of enthusiastic "Anglo-Catholics," who in front of the organ had set up an inscription in mammoth letters—"Praised be Jesus Christ

in the Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar." Slipping into infidelity on one side and on the other repudiating the Reformation, to this sad pass has come the great National Church of England! There was pathos in the protest of those hapless Evangelicals, the pathos of those who find that life has gone out of their cause, that it has no longer power to retain its adherents, that its glories have passed, whilst the institution which it persecuted and tried to destroy is more vigorous and active than ever. So it was at Ephesus when the victorious course of Christianity began and, instinctively, Sir William Joynson Hicks, Bishop Knox and their Nonconformist friends adopted the same futile tactics as the Ephesians. They said repeatedly, "Great is the blessed Reformation," and, no doubt, the reiteration comforted an audience which the need and occasion of the meeting must have tended to depress. But they did not specify in any detail what made the Reformation great or blessed: they took that very much for granted, naturally enough considering the character and object of the meeting. When the chief speaker condescended to particulars he did not get beyond negatives. "We want no priestly interference, we ask for no purgatory, and we will submit to no compulsory confessional"—was one of his loudly-cheered periods. It might surprise him to know—and for a man who has climbed to his official elevation he knows singularly little about the religion against which he protests—that the same sentiments rightly understood might be vigorously acclaimed by a Catholic audience. No Catholic wants priestly interference but only priestly help: still less does the genuine Catholic ask for purgatory, but rather strives, with all the aids his Mother the Church gives him, to evade it: and if he really needs the Sacrament of Penance it is his own self-interest, not merely the command of the Church, that compels him to seek that gracious relief. Although one might hear, could infants speak, from an occasional nursery—"we will submit to no compulsory washing," still no hospital has ever yet echoed to the cry—"No compulsory healing." When beings are rational, moral compulsion comes through the reason: men realize that such and such a course is best for them, or confers a singular benefit, and, compelled by their own self-interest, they take it.

The Albert Hall meeting, so the programme informed us, cost £750 to organize; yet we should judge that the movement, against which the demonstration was held, is not a penny the worse. What *was* demonstrated was the disintegration of Protestantism, but that is already so obvious that the expenditure must, we fear, be considered wholly unnecessary.

J.K.

A NEW ARISTOTLE<sup>1</sup>

**A**MONG the many publications of the Clarendon Press not least important are those which concern Aristotle. Already the English translations of the "Works of Aristotle" (of which Professor Ross is one of the editors and to which he contributed in 1908 the translation of the "Metaphysics") are almost complete. Already there has been published Professor Joachim's carefully-revised text and valuable commentary on the "De Generatione et Corruptione," 1922. And now appear two large volumes containing a revised text of the "Metaphysics," 620 pages of Commentary, and an Introduction comprising 166 pages. The text which most scholars use is that of Bekker, whose pagination has become almost universally adopted for purposes of reference. This pagination, of course, Professor Ross retains. Also, unlike Professor Joachim, who finds two mistakes per page in the *apparatus criticus* of Bekker, Professor Ross defends Bekker in several instances as against W. Christ. There is, however, one important manuscript, "Vindobonensis" (tenth-century, and probably the earliest extant), of which neither Bekker nor Christ takes account. This Professor Ross has carefully collated. A detailed discussion of the value of various sources and of the manner in which they have been collated and used will be found in the 5th part of the Introduction.

Another most interesting and important question discussed in the Introduction (Part I.) is that of the structure of the "Metaphysics." Strictly speaking, Aristotle is not the author of this book, though he is the author of its various parts (all of them, it would seem), which others collected and joined together to form what purports to be a single treatise. Thus, Books *αΔΚ* are clearly intrusions. *ΑΒΓΕ* and *ΖΗΘ*, on the other hand, have usually been regarded as closely connected treatises (*v.g.*, by Brandis and Bonitz); and this view Professor Ross upholds, as against Jaeger, basing his argument mainly on the fact that the various problems set forth in *Β* all receive in the later parts some kind of treatment and answer. He agrees, however, with Jaeger that the "we" in *Α* means "we Platonists," and hence infers that this Book was probably written between 348 and 345, when Aristotle was still a Platonist, and quite possibly was lecturing to the Platonic circle at Assos.

Those who have read Professor A. E. Taylor's "Varia Socratica" (1911) will do well to study carefully Part II. of Professor Ross's Introduction ("Socrates, Plato, and the Platonists") before adopting the view that the Theory of Ideas which Aristotle

<sup>1</sup> *Aristotle's Metaphysics*. A revised Text with Introduction and Commentary. By W. D. Ross, Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. Clarendon Press. Two vols., pp. clxvi. and 366, 528. Price 48s. net. 1924.



rejects was not in reality that of Plato, but of the school at Megara. Whatever Plato may have meant by "separated" ideas, it would at least seem to be he who first "separated" them.

In Part III. of the Introduction, Aristotle's *Metaphysical Doctrine* is set forth at considerable length, and in Part IV. his *Theology*. These parts, read in conjunction with the Commentary, will be especially interesting to scholastics, since in them we have both an interpretation and a criticism of Aristotle, based on a wide and thorough knowledge of the whole of his work and of the opinions of many of his leading commentators, including St. Thomas. Aristotle is difficult reading, and to understand him one must collate and compare passage with passage. This Professor Ross does, and it is in this, no less than in the critical text, that lies the great value of his work. To the English student, desirous of acquiring a first-hand knowledge of the "*Metaphysics*," these two fine volumes will be welcome, as providing him with all the material he requires.

In general, too, though not in all cases, the scholastic, trained in a school in which an Aristotelian tradition still lives, will agree with the conclusions reached by the most recent of his multitudinous commentators, and will find both in the Introduction and the Commentary many remarks which throw light upon subjects with which he is familiar. Thus the method of the "*Metaphysics*" is aptly described as being:

not that of advance from premises to conclusion, but a working back from common-sense views and distinctions to some more precise truth of which they are an inaccurate expression, and the confirmation of such truth by pointing out the consequences of its denial (lxxvii.).

Again, if matter itself is not intelligible, how better explain that curious term "intelligible matter" than as

a shorthand phrase for the material, pluralizing element in the intelligible, [just] as *ἅλη γεννητή* is not generable but is the material element in generable things (cii.).

Or, as a further instance, take the passage in which Professor Ross gives his answer to the difficult question "whether God is for Aristotle only the final cause, or the efficient cause as well, of change" (cxxxiv.).

There can be no doubt about the answer. "Efficient cause" is simply the translation of Aristotle's *ἀρχὴ τῆς κινήσεως*, and God is certainly this. The truth is that the opposition of *οὐ ἔνεκα* to *ἀρχὴ κινήσεως* is not a well-chosen one. The *οὐ ἔνεκα* is one kind of *ἀρχὴ κινήσεως*. The cause of movement may be either (1) an end aimed at, or (2) a force operating *a tergo*, which may be (a) a

physical force, or (b) a mental force, an act of will. What Aristotle does imply is that God's causation is not either of the two latter types. It cannot be inferred, from the fact that Aristotle describes God as exercising infinite power, that he thinks of Him as an efficient cause of type 2(b); the statement that He causes motion as an object of desire or of love is too explicit for that. Yet He is not an end existing merely in the future; He exists eternally and thus differs from a merely imagined and anticipated ideal.

On the other hand, the general impression one gathers from reading the Introduction and Commentary contained in Professor Ross's two volumes is that, though Aristotle was an acute, he was by no means a consistent thinker; that often, indeed, his thinking was confused. Again and again these inconsistencies and confusions of thought are pointed out to us. Possibly they exist. Possibly they exist in Aristotle. Yet a stronger case for Aristotle's consistency might, I think, be made out than that which lies before me.

For instance, in 1068b 26—1069a 14, contact and successiveness are first defined, and we are then told that successiveness comprises contact as a particular case. But, if this be so, argues Professor Ross, "if the *ἀπτόμενον* be necessarily *ἐξῆς*, then *ἐχόμενον* is a mere synonym of *ἀπτόμενον* and ll. 1, 2 are misleading." Yet it is only when things "touching" are also one *in kind* that Aristotle calls them "continuous" (*συνεχές*); which is a particular case of successiveness, since between them is no third thing of the same kind. In the phrase *τοῦτο δ' ἐφεξῆς*, the word *τοῦτο* seems clearly to refer to the type of contact of which Aristotle has been discussing in ll. 5-8, *i.e.*, to the type in which things "grow together" and are of the same kind. When things touch, but are not of the same kind, they are not continuous, so that to touch cannot be synonymous with the being continuous.

Nor does the remark in 1069a 18 that "our speculation is about substance, for the principles and causes of substances are what we seek," in reality conflict with the prior definition of "Metaphysics" as the study of being-as-such. For, if substance be, as Aristotle claims, the primary type of being which all derivative types presuppose, to study this primary type of being will evidently be the chief function of the metaphysician. To say this, however, is scarce to restrict metaphysics "to the study of one department of being" (lxxix.): it is merely to point out that from the nature of the case it must be with substance that metaphysics is principally concerned.

Incidentally, too, the phrase *καὶ εἰ τῷ ἐφεξῆς, καὶ οὕτως πρῶτον ἢ οὐσία, εἴτα τὸ ποιόν, εἴτα τὸ ποσόν*, can hardly mean "if, on the other hand, we regard the universe as consisting

merely of the categories arranged in a series, substance is evidently the first member of the series" (II. 349). The contrast is between the Megaric view, which considers the universe as a genuine unity or whole ( $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \delta\lambda\omicron\nu\ \tau\iota\ \tau\acute{o}\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$ ), and the view of it as a time-series. In both cases substance is prior to quality and quantity, but in neither is it prior in the order of time, but only in the order of presupposition or condition or ground.

I doubt, too, whether Professor Ross is right in regarding "first substance" as a category. The instances which Aristotle gives of the categories—"man," "ox," "runs," "wins," in opposition to "man runs," "man wins" (lxxxii.), seem to indicate just the reverse. It is only the specific nature of a substance (*e.g.*, the specific nature of "man"), considered in the abstract and as a universal, *second* substance, in short, that is a category; not this specific nature, *qua* something which exists in the concrete and has substantial being.

Again, does the thought of substance as substratum "really lead to a wrong result" (xciv.). If we prescind from all characteristics we get *matter* as substratum, Professor Ross urges. True; but, if matter can never exist without form, in the concrete this matter will be specified by form; which form is presupposed by specific properties as a constituent in the ultimate subject, no less than is the material principle which is presupposed by the possibility of change. For this reason it is, it seems to me, at least conceivable that substance may exist without "quality," in so far as substance does not presuppose quality for its existence. The objection (xci.) that "the differentia of any substance is a quality," overlooks the fact that, as Aristotle has pointed out (1020b), the term "quality" may be used in several senses. If used as the equivalent of "specific difference," quality pertains to substance, but if it means sensible quality such as "whiteness" or "weight," it does not; and it is only from quality in this latter and more usual sense that it is claimed that substance can be "separated."

I find his treatment of "substance" the least satisfactory part of Professor Ross's exposition of Aristotle's doctrine, and under this head I include the treatment of "matter," which is a constituent in all sensible substances. There is ground for contrasting Plato's conception of matter as "extension" or "extensiveness" with Aristotle's conception of it as an ultimate subject, in itself indeterminate, yet susceptible alike of form and of change of form. But to identify this essentially dynamic concept of matter with "our ordinary notion of matter, something that has solidity as well as extension," or again, to speak of it as existing in "layers" (cii.), seems to me no less foreign to the thought of Aristotle than it is to that of Plato. Aristotle, like Kant, is seeking the ultimate conditions or grounds which are pre-

supposed by, and will account for, the world of changeful phenomena; but, unlike Kant, he seeks them in the world itself, and not in the mind that contemplates it. A careful analysis reveals the fact that there are two such principles or pre-suppositions, an indeterminate principle called "matter" and a determining and intelligible principle called form. There are diverse ways and diverse degrees in which matter may be determined, and hence an order amongst "potentialities," but to describe matter as a solid and these potentialities as its various layers, is not, I submit, what Aristotle means when he speaks of "different kinds of matter."

But be this as it may, we congratulate Professor Ross on the gigantic task which he has accomplished, both in revising the text of the "Metaphysics" and in writing for it so full an introduction and upon it a so long and so detailed commentary. As he remarks in the Preface:

No Editor of the "Metaphysics" is likely to suppose that he has solved all the outstanding problems of this desperately difficult work, and I am certainly free from that illusion.

None the less, the enormous amount of ordered material and the valuable comments which are made upon it, carry us a long way towards the solution of some of these problems.

L.J.W.

---

#### FATHER JOHN HUNGERFORD POLLEN, S.J.

**R**EADERS of THE MONTH will join with its staff and his religious brethren generally in lamenting the death of Father John Pollen whose writings have so frequently appeared in its pages during a period of nearly forty years. Although never formally attached to THE MONTH'S staff, his association with it could hardly have been closer or more helpful had he been so. His earliest contribution is dated November, 1887, and its subject—"Father Henry Garnet and the Gunpowder Plot"—shows how early his genius for historical research had declared itself. From that time until about twelve months ago a stream of valuable articles flowed from his pen, mostly connected with his immediate subject, the English Reformation—in which his interest was engaged early in his career as a Jesuit by his being associated with Father John Morris, S.J., himself a zealous and fruitful worker in the same field, and a Vice-Postulator for the cause of the English Martyrs. But of course his MONTH contributions represented only a small part of his historical labours. After his ordination in 1891 he was definitely set

aside to write the history of the English Province of the Society, and spent several years in Rome and at Exaeten gathering materials for this work. Later on he spent some months amongst the records at Simancas (Spain), so misused by the historian Froude.

On his return to England in 1899, he became, in his turn, Vice-Postulator for the English Martyrs, and henceforward gave his whole attention to these two kindred subjects. From time to time he published, either as Editor or collaborator or on his own account, various volumes elucidating Elizabethan history, his chief work being undoubtedly "The English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth: a Study of their Politics, Civil Life and Government, 1558—1580," published through Messrs. Longmans in 1919. Although writing of a period when Catholic religious politics were the subject of keen debate and divergence, and when the action of his own Society was strenuously opposed and bitterly criticized, his sense of fairness and judicial temper were generally recognized, even by those in whom survives to-day some reflection of the old hostile tradition. As contributor to Dom Bede Camm's first series of "Lives of the English Martyrs," and co-editor with Canon Burton of the second series, as well as contributor to its pages, he was brought into intimate connection with eminent fellow-workers, and some of his most valuable work consisted in his editing of various volumes of the Catholic Record Society. The late Bishop Ward, the learned historian of Catholic Emancipation, used from time to time to consult him regarding his great work, and an historian of another stamp, the late Andrew Lang, who sought his help on many occasions, bore public testimony to his candour and fair-mindedness.

His reputation led to his being asked at the beginning of the century by the Scottish Historical Society to investigate the relations between the Holy See and Queen Mary Stuart, and he edited as a result the volume entitled "Papal Negotiations with Mary Queen of Scots" (1901). His interest in that subject continued unabated, and almost the last book he published was a long and careful analysis—"Queen Mary and the Babington Plot" (1922)—of the webs of deceit and treachery which enveloped the closing years of Elizabeth's victim. "The Counter-Reformation in Scotland" (1921) is another indication of his wide knowledge of the religious history of the sister kingdom.

It is a singular reflection that, after so many years of preparatory study and research, Father Pollen was stricken by his last illness before he had published even the first section of what was to have been the work of his life—the "History of the English Province S.J." The material he accumulated and digested, some of which is in an advanced stage of readiness, will of

course be of immense value to his successor, and his name will no doubt be linked with the work when it appears. However, his devotion to the Society and its Founder found admirable expression in the very last work he published, "St. Ignatius of Loyola" (1924), a biography written by a master of the literature of its subject and embodying the latest results of research.

It were scarcely fitting, even were there time in this hurried sketch, to speak of the more intimate qualities of our departed friend and colleague, those traits of character and practices of religious virtue which made him one of the most companionable of men. He inherited not a little of the artistic genius of his parents, and was a capable draughtsman and an art critic of discernment. But what those who lived with him noticed most was his unselfish readiness to help others and to put his great stores of historical learning at their disposal. Always equable in temper, he was, to the end, industrious, unassuming and kind. His failure in health, which began early in 1923, he bore with the utmost cheerfulness, seeming not to feel the disappointment, which affected others, at his having to leave his labours with so much still to do, before they could be adequately crowned. But his actual achievement is not slight, and the Catholics of this country to whose cause he devoted his life will not forget him in death.

## II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

### Germany's Choice.

On Sunday, April 26th, the German people elected as their President Field-Marshal von Hindenburg by a comparatively small majority over Herr Marx, the Republican candidate.

On the face of it this seems to be a decision fraught with ominous consequences to the peace of Europe. Hindenburg in many eyes represents a monarchical and militarist reaction, whilst Herr Marx stood for a peaceful and faithful observance by Germany of all her obligations. But we think that a study of the figures does not necessarily support a pessimistic conclusion and we trust that it will not be used to strengthen the hands of those whose creed is that Germany can never be trusted and therefore must at all costs be kept weak and divided. The Marshal after all secured less than half the voters in an exceptionally heavy poll. And it was the man, rather than the militarist policy he is supposed to represent, that attracted their suffrages. In the previous ballot a much more determined reactionary, General Ludendorff, was at the bottom of the poll with a ridiculously small vote.



The choice of the national hero, however, may well have been determined by the resentment Germans still feel in regard to the Ruhr and to the continued occupation of the Cologne area by the British, *without open justification*. It is all very well to say that Germany is in default in regard to disarmament, but, although the proofs are alleged to be in Allied possession now for many months, they are not published. In international matters, as well as in civil law, it is almost as important to seem just as to be just. In the circumstances the narrow majority for the soldier may well be considered surprising.

**Not  
necessarily a blow  
to Peace.**

We trust that the friends of peace will not yield to panic and consider that European harmony has been indefinitely deferred by this election. We are convinced that it is a "gesture," and that the great majority of the German people consider that their welfare is no longer allied with Prussianism. It would be disastrous if the policy now adopted by the Allies seemed to suggest the contrary view. We have never sought to deny that many details of the conduct of the victors have given Germany good grounds for thinking that she could not look to them for generous or even fair treatment. The mistaken decision to punish by what amounted to distraint of all their goods, not the guilty authors of the war, but their misguided peoples, has kept Europe seething with unrest and misery for five years, and recoiled in disaster upon the victors themselves. The way to restored prosperity does not lie in that direction. If Germany, democratic and peaceful, becomes persuaded that no trust is to be placed in the justice or good will of the Allies, the presidency of Marshal von Hindenburg may be fated to make them turn again to their old political god of narrow self-interest, backed by enormous military force.

**Incompatible  
Peace  
Policies.**

It does not rest with the Allies to blame this spirit, for the same is rife in all the Governments of Europe. On the one hand, considerable support is given to the League of Nations —let that be freely granted—but, on the other, a wholly incompatible policy is simultaneously pursued. There has been no complete change of heart, no determination to outlaw war and to reduce armaments to the proportion required to sanction a universal will for peace. At most, an attempt is being made to graft the new on the old, to unite the security which comes from universal agreement with that based upon isolated strength. And the misery of the situation is that one cannot point to any "villain in the piece," any buccaneer nation whose contempt of morality and law forces the rest into ways of violence. The

Governments are not consciously wrong-headed. Until the League of Nations is a reality, embodying the common will and devoted to the common good, no State can afford to disarm, for international influence is directly proportional to national strength. What we do blame statesmen for, and not only statesmen but the whole tribe of journalists, is that their attempts to create the new spirit are not continuous, consistent and vigorous: they have no vision, no concerted plan. As we pointed out in April, the Protocol was rejected by Great Britain because of incidental and remediable defects, although its main lines are those on which progress towards international peace *must* ultimately be made. Unless there is a universal and abiding purpose to arbitrate or to permit mediation before fighting, because war in the present state of the world injures the interests of all nations, there can be no real advance. We are wilfully blinding ourselves and making true views on international affairs impossible, if we do not recognize the growing interdependence of States, and abandon the old notion of their independence, which, never really a correct one, has now become grotesquely untrue. Political independence vanished when economic dependence became real. Nations are now too close to each other to ignore each other's well-being or scorn each other's good will—too close also for security unless good will is there. Otherwise, they must fear each other, and when there is fear there is no freedom. The nations must shed their parade of independence, and find compensation in the freedom from fear to be found in mutual understanding and association.

**The Fall  
of  
M. Herriot.**

M. Herriot after all did not die "from eating the Pope," but succumbed to financial misdemeanours. But if he had not antagonized the Catholicity of France, the internal loan which he sought might have been subscribed, so that his anti-clericalism contributed to his fate. And the same fate from the same cause will await his successor, unless he does justice to Catholics. The new French ministerial programme promises to maintain "a highly-qualified representative" at the Vatican, speaks honied words to Alsace and Lorraine—"those recovered provinces are too dear to our hearts, the day of ineffable joy, when they were restored to their true motherhood, is too vivid in our minds to allow misconceptions—heated, perhaps, but sure to grow less—to bring about a serious misunderstanding between these provinces and the Government"—and undertakes that "the assimilation of their legislation to that of France" will be discussed in a friendly way with their representatives. M. Painlevé had, no doubt, to walk delicately amidst various rocks of offence, but we shall be surprised if the "highly-qualified representative"

does not turn out to be an Ambassador after all and if the "misconceptions" about the attitude of Alsace have not all been on the part of the Government. We are sure General de Castelnau's organization will not relax its vigilance, but will make abundantly clear to the Ministry that what French Catholics demand in the matter of education is "the assimilation" of the laws of France to those of the restored provinces; in other words, the restoration of liberty of conscience. A State which includes such a large proportion of Catholics as France does has no right to be positively and aggressively "lay." An apologist for M. Herriot, in a journal which poses as an organ of sound political thinking,<sup>1</sup> says that all he wanted to do was to introduce *l'école laïque* into Alsace, as if that monstrosity were something morally unobjectionable. "He did nothing but apply the French law on French territory," says this disingenuous scribe, not realizing that this particular French law is an iniquity, against the introduction of which the two provinces had received the highest State assurances.

**False Theories  
in  
Education.**

It is regrettable to find that the "lay-school" in its modified English form still finds support from a section of English teachers. The President of the N.U.T., speaking at their Oxford Conference during Easter, declared against the dual system as a hindrance to educational progress and demanded for teachers, "as State servants," freedom from theological tests. What a pity it is that members of a profession which should aim at exact thinking allow themselves to be misled by unproven assumptions and undefined terms! They assume that there can be real education without religion or, alternatively, that there can be religion without dogma, *i.e.*, without certainty. If that were the case, then clearly it would not matter what teachers believed. But since education means training of the will as well as of the mind, *i.e.*, instruction in morality which is based upon our relations with God; and since those relations have been declared and defined in the Christian revelation, such instruction can be safely entrusted only to believers. As for teachers being servants of the State, all that means is that they are paid by the people composing the State to do what those people—the parents of the school-children—are incompetent or too busy to do themselves. The State is not a separate entity from the citizens: therefore, if the citizens, as many of them do, want denominational education for their children, teachers must fit themselves to give it and show evidence of their fitness if required. It is all very simple if we rid ourselves of prejudice, are not deceived by the fallacy of abstraction and do not seek to ignore facts.

<sup>1</sup> *The Irish Statesman*, April 18th.

**Zionism  
unjust.**

We cannot pretend to grieve that Lord Balfour had to make a hurried and undignified departure from Syria, considering the mission that brought him to the East. We need not

repeat the objections to the particular development of Zionism due to the war, which have frequently been expressed in these columns and which are based upon the sound principle that one cannot lawfully dispose of what does not belong to one. Now, Palestine is an Arabian country, and no more belongs to the Jews than does Poland or Russia itself. The original Balfour Declaration, which was subsequently endorsed by the Allies, stated that the British Government would regard with favour the establishment in Palestine of a "National Home for the Jewish people" and would try to bring it about. No doubt the Jews whose favour and financial aid was won by this somewhat non-committal declaration were assured that it would be interpreted in accordance with their desires. At any rate, when Palestine was entrusted by the League of Nations to England as a Mandate (April, 1920), the whole influence of the first British Governor, himself a Jew, was, in accordance with the terms of the Mandate, devoted to establishing the Jews in a privileged position in this Arab State. A Zionist Commission was imported to assist the Governor, and in his Council of 20 only seven places were allotted to the non-Jewish elements, Arab and Christian. Soon after the establishment of the Mandate, Cardinal Bourne called attention<sup>1</sup> to the way in which the original inhabitants were being expropriated by Jewish Syndicates, and early in May, 1922, Pope Benedict XV. complained about the Jewish maltreatment of Catholics in Palestine, declaring that the rule of the Turk was more just and equitable. It was, then, the declared policy of the Zionist Commission to introduce into Palestine some 50,000 or 60,000 Jews annually so as to make the country "just as Jewish as America is American." The only result, according to credible reports, has been to flood the land with the scum of various Ghettos to the scandal and demoralization of the inhabitants.

**Zionist  
Policy must  
be revised.**

It will be remembered that in June, 1922, the Conservative Government suffered a heavy defeat in the House of Lords on this very question when, in spite of the pleading of Lord

Balfour, then making his first speech as a peer, the House decided that the Palestinian Mandate "directly violates the pledges made by H.M. Government to the people of Palestine in the declaration of October, 1915, and again in the declaration of November, 1918, and is, as at present framed, opposed to the

<sup>1</sup> At the Liverpool Catholic Congress, 1920.

sentiments and wishes of the great majority of the people of Palestine." Yet the project was carried out, and the intervening years have but emphasized its defects and the rightful opposition it arouses amongst the natives. Lord Balfour's speech plainly indicated the spirit in which it was conceived—a spirit the very opposite of that which it was hoped the issue of the war had engendered in the great nations. "A Mandate," he said, "is a self-imposed limitation by the conquerors on the sovereignty which they exercise over the conquered territories." Here the implication is that Palestine, which we professed to have liberated from the tyranny of the Turks, was in reality the conquest of our arms, to be disposed of as we thought fit. What wonder that the Palestinian Arabs and Christians, not to speak of the Jews long settled there, view with rooted hostility the project associated with the name of a man who so ruthlessly ignored their rights. Zionism as at present administered is a menace to the peace of the world, and we trust that, when the Mandatory reports to the Mandates Commission of the League, that body will take a serious view of a policy which in its conception and development so directly contravenes League principles. We are glad to see that other Catholic papers share our views and we are mystified in consequence by a remark of the *Church Times* (April 17th) that "the curious pro-Zionist tone of the Roman Catholic Press cannot be disregarded." What dark plot our Anglican contemporary, whose own remarks on Zionism and in general on social matters are always sound and interesting, has got on the tracks of we cannot imagine. But its acquaintance with the Roman Catholic Press seems to be limited.

Mr. Amery on April 23rd made out as good a case as he could for the present Palestine regime but ignored the fundamental injustice which vitiates all the rest.

#### **Economic Danger of Reparations.**

Whatever Government takes charge of Germany must deal with the problem of reparations. The Dawes Plan has caused a temporary lull in the question, but the Dawes Plan cannot change the elementary facts of economics. Any scheme of reparations means that Germany every year produces a trade surplus, for it is only out of the excess value of exports over imports that reparations can be made. The *Saturday Review* has at last discovered (April 4th) what it owns some observers saw in 1919, viz., that German goods must capture the markets by their cheapness, and that they can only be made cheap by the practical enslavement of the German producer, labouring long hours for low wages. Hence two inevitable results—widespread damage to Germany's competitors whilst the system lasts: final revolt of Germany's workers unless it is ended.

If cheap German goods are fought by tariffs, then the reparation fund is diminished: in any case, that weapon cannot be used by England, which must see unemployment grow, whilst German firms secure even English contracts. Pope Benedict XV. was wiser than all the Chancellories of Europe when in 1917 he counselled cancellation of war-debts. The other question—the exploitation of German workers—explains the hostility of International Labour to the Dawes Plan and tends to cripple the action of the International Labour Bureau of the League of Nations whose aim is to eliminate un-Christian competition by humanizing the conditions of labour all over the world. It is with that object that the new French Government lays stress in its programme on "the loyal enforcement of the eight-hour day, which is the indispensable guarantee of the progress of the working-classes": it can hardly complain if German workers themselves insist on that guarantee. Let it be remembered that the Dawes Plan, whilst fining Germany 125 million pounds a year, fixes no limit to the total amount to be demanded. We predict a very short life for the Dawes Plan, once Germany has a settled Government. She can quote M. Loucheur, the well-known French politician, addressing the United States in the following blunt terms:<sup>1</sup>

You ask us to pay our war-debts. We cannot pay. We cannot pay now and we cannot pay ever. No clear-headed man with a real knowledge of financial facts has the remotest idea that we can ever pay. The only possible way, in which we could pay is in our goods, and you will not take our goods. We cannot pay in our currency. You will not take that. You demand gold, and you have all the gold in the world in your own vaults. And now you prepare to erect a tariff-wall round your own country that will still more completely bar out our goods.

And more appositely still, from her own point of view, she can recall the following utterance of the same distinguished man in the Senate—"Germany cannot pay these indemnities. If she were able to pay them, it would make her master of the world's trade. Let us, therefore, insist on security rather than on reparations." Sometimes in civil affairs the expense and trouble of collecting a tax far exceed the benefit derived from it. Then the wise legislator repeals it.

#### **Seeds of War.**

How shall Europe pacify the Balkans? Under the oppression of the Turk, and indeed of the Austrian, they were, naturally enough, seething cauldrons of unrest. But now that they are free from Turk and Austrian alike, they continue to seethe.

<sup>1</sup> Reported in *The Times*, February, 1922.



Not one State of them all but has some wrong-headed ideal or ambition, for the relief of which it is ready for a thousand injustices. And into this amalgam of raw, half-civilized peoples, the fears and friendship of France, equally misguided, have poured a constant stream of modern war equipment, so that, instead of settling down to ordered life, they are either oppressing some racial minority within their boundaries or threatening one another. We trust that some day, when the League of Nations attains its proper power, it will proceed to disarm these turbulent folk, as one of them, Bulgaria, is already disarmed. At a time when every effort should have been made to recover lost prosperity by peaceful commerce and by the freest interchange of services these new nations, flushed with freedom, thought of nothing but making themselves "strong," set up enormous armies out of all proportion to their needs, and began a tariff war against each other, almost equally wasteful and unnecessary. And, one and all, on some pretext or other, started discriminating between their citizens with bitter injustice, when mutual tolerance and equal justice were most needed for peace. Post-war hostility so maltreated the ex-enemy States, Austria and Hungary, shut out, as they are, from the sea by unfriendly neighbours, that they would have perished, had not the League of Nations come to their aid. But the chief blot on the conduct of these new States has been their unfair treatment of racial minorities. The impossibility of making political boundaries square with ethnical after the war resulted in many groups, differing in race, religion and culture from the majority, being included in many States, and with remarkable unanimity every one of the various Peace Treaties, some ten in all, bore clauses specially inserted to secure the rights of these minorities and to place them under the guarantee of the League of Nations. Thus, the Allied Powers showed themselves fully aware of the danger to future peace involved in these clashings of race, and made these provisions in order to mitigate as much as possible the hardships of the new boundaries.

**Rumania  
and  
Minorities.**

Yet the foolish cult of uniformity which seems to obsess modern Governments has run counter to these wise provisions in many States.

Italy, which should know better and set a better example to the new Governments, is said to be suppressing the German language and culture in her new possession, the Upper Adige. France, as we have seen, wants her recovered provinces to be legally "assimilated" with the Republic, at whatever cost to justice and good faith. But the most notorious example of breach of treaty in letter and in spirit is afforded by Rumania, a State which has doubled its size at comparatively little cost

as a result of the war. A special correspondent of *America* over two years ago called attention to the appalling persecution of minorities, religious and racial, which, in despite and defiance of the League, that country was carrying on in its new possessions, a persecution which moved even *The Times* (April 16, 1923) to grave and indignant protest. That ill-treatment, which affects all religions but the Rumanian Orthodox, consists of barefaced confiscation and embezzlement of Church property, the closing of churches and schools, the endeavour to compel apostasy, the suppression of languages other than Rumanian—in fact, every form of injustice which the Treaties of Trianon and Alba Julia were drawn up precisely to prevent. So incredibly wicked has been this savage tyranny that the special Commission to Transylvania, appointed by the American Committee on the Rights of Religious Minorities, recently declared in its report that "unless a solution can be found for the present problems—racial, linguistic, religious and economic—Transylvania will continue to be one of the saddest lands in Europe and a menacing danger-spot for the peace of the world." It is not too much to say that the League of Nations will stand or fall according as it succeeds or fails to remedy, as it is its duty to do, this gross and continued outrage against what is now the public law of Europe. Hungary, as distinct from Austria, was perhaps the least blameworthy of our late foes, and yet has received the most terrible punishment. Though it be true that the Magyars in the days of their power were themselves tyrannical and unjust, that is no reason or justification for the pitiless treatment meted out to them now. It will be the task of all justice-loving nations in the League to secure a drastic revision of frontiers which may restore some millions of Hungarians to their proper Government, and put a speedy check on Rumania's brutal policy towards minorities.

**The "Child-Labour  
Amendment"  
in U.S.A.**

European readers are apt to be puzzled concerning the attitude of Catholics in the United States towards the Twentieth (Child-Labour) Amendment, which aims at giving the Federal Government "power to limit, regulate and prohibit the labour of persons under 18 years of age." The singular inapplicancy of the name is the first puzzle: youths in their 'teens, who may validly contract marriage and assume the cares of a household, can hardly be styled children; yet these would come under the law. Then we find that Catholic opinion, so far from being united on this moral question, is strongly divided, although the principles involved might seem to demand Catholic unanimity. The new and very able review, the *Commonweal*, admits articles calling for the ratification of the Twentieth Amendment by the several States, in the name of humanity and decency. Writers

in the outspoken *Fortnightly Review* of St. Louis take the same line. *America*, on the other hand, a fearless champion of Christian liberty, is strongly opposed to its ratification, and insists on its manifold defects and dangers. There can be, of course, no difference in principle between these representative journals. *America* cannot be thought to view with indifference the fate of the million hapless children employed, often unhealthily, in factories and commerce without adequate legal supervision and protection. Nor can the *Commonweal* be blind to the danger of paternalism, which in a non-Catholic community readily turns into Cæsarism, or the usurpation by the State of certain inalienable rights belonging to the individual, the family or private associations. The abuse to be remedied is flagrant. In *America* the exploitation of labour is carried to a degree which would not be tolerated in this country, and it naturally most affects the weak and helpless. And again in *America*, the natural tendency of the Federal Government to encroach upon State rights, immensely developed as it has been by the war, is alarming all lovers of liberty and making them keen to resist encroachments. In so far as the Amendment comes to the aid of those ground down by ruthless commercialism, all Christians must be in sympathy with it; but in so far as it takes away the powers of self-government guaranteed to the individual States by the Constitution, all Christians should resist it. It is a pity that it was not so framed as to accomplish its humanitarian purpose without destroying vital rights. A simple clause reserving the final word to the State concerned would, one would think, have laid the responsibility on the right shoulders, and satisfied both justice and charity.

**A  
Fixed  
Easter.**

The celebration of the sixteenth Centenary of the Council of Nicæa recalls the fact that it was in that great Assembly that the date of Easter was first made uniform for the whole of Christendom. We have no doubt that the intervention of the Church will be again called for in respect to this matter—this time to attach the observance of Easter to some more or less fixed day in the Calendar. This year, as it happens, the incidence of Easter on the second Sunday in April corresponds exactly with the recommendations of Lord Desborough, an untiring and influential advocate of Calendar reform, whose activities, in and out of Parliament, form the spear-head of the movement. The matter, as of world-wide interest, was naturally referred to the League of Nations, which, as naturally, since religious considerations are essentially involved, sought through a special Committee the views of the Pope and of other religious leaders. A Conference under the auspices of the League was

held in Paris just a year ago, wherein Father Gianfranceschi, S.J., represented the Holy See, but the result was inconclusive. The Conference agreed that no question of principle was involved, but felt that no change should be made until the desire became much stronger and more universal. As we have before suggested, reformers are grasping at too much and therefore getting nothing. If they concentrated on endeavouring to get Easter fixed, say, for the second Sunday in April, and thus leave it variable by seven days, they would secure most of the practical advantages aimed at. The "scientific" reform of the Calendar, whereby it is sought to make the month and the year symmetrical, and the day of the week and of the month correspond in every year, might make past history more difficult whilst affording no great advantage in the present.

**Pseudo-  
Science.**

So frequently are the discoveries of "missing-links" paraded nowadays and so invariably are they subsequently explained away or exploded that it would save expense to keep one's reflections on the phenomenon in standing type. A Roman Congregation in the dawn of science shared the almost universal contemporary view of Galileo's evidence in support of the Copernican theory, and mistakenly condemned his work: that has proved sufficient to brand the Church as obscurantist for all time. But the blunders of scientific men are legion, and every age adds to the pile of abandoned hypotheses, many of which were begotten of prejudice or want of logic or even carelessness, testifying to the shortcomings of the hierarchy of science. Yet no one seeks to discredit "science" because of the fallibility of her votaries. Only those who are prudent learn caution in accepting the revolutionary conclusions which eager scientists proclaim with such dogmatic insistence. Especially will this be the case when evidence for the evolution of man from lower forms of life is alleged, for nowhere else do we find such exhibitions of unscientific credulity and assurance. As we have often pointed out, the attempts made in museums to illustrate the supposed descent of man from monkey rest on mere guess-work and assumption: facts are interpreted to justify preconceived theory whereas theory should be deduced from facts. Curiously-shaped stones have been hailed as petrified skulls, like the late discovery in the Patagonian Andes. Other skulls like the Rhodesian, in November, 1921, have been assigned a fabulous antiquity and afterwards found to be comparatively modern. The Talgai skull dug up some years ago in Australia figured as a "missing-link," until an official unkindly pointed out that it was of a black boy lately killed and buried in a primitive deposit. And now in regard to this year's find,—the Taungs skull from Bechuanaland,

pronounced by a South African professor to be that of an ape-man, half a million years old,—another professor of the same Witwatersrand University suggests that, from the nature of its surroundings, it may have dropped into the deposit in which it was found through a cavity which was afterwards closed, and be comparatively modern. Yet, no doubt, we shall find the Taungs skull duly added to the museum collections. We do not sympathize with the action of the State of Tennessee in forbidding "Darwinism" to be taught in its public schools: there are better ways of refuting error than that: but the dogmatism of many scientists makes it intelligible.

**C.T.S.  
Annual Meeting.**

The aims of the Catholic Truth Society are so essentially apostolic, its methods so natural and so direct, that its progress is a valuable indication of the progress of the Faith in England. Its annual meeting has just been held, and its members must have been gratified with the records of its advance. The Forward Movement has multiplied its membership by ten, although it is still far short of what might reasonably be expected, considering its *raison d'être*. If its growth is indicative of the vigour of the Catholic spirit in the country at large, its activity in any particular locality will obviously be a token that Catholics there are alive to the demands of their profession. But the reverse also may be true, and certainly the neglect to employ this particular instrument of evangelization, unless good cause can be shown, would seem to imply at least an astonishing blindness to its utility. We have on previous occasions called attention to this very weak spot in the working of the C.T.S., which is not due to any defect in its officials or constitution, but simply to what we may call the apathy of its *clientèle*. It may be gathered from the report that the output of literature, although steadily growing, is not noticeably much greater than it was when the active membership of the Society was some 1,600 and its income correspondingly small. From that we infer that the distribution of its wares has by no means increased proportionately to its membership. Now practically the only means the Society has for disseminating the bulk of its literature consists in the display-cases at church-doors. Investigations by the recently-formed "Box Tenders' Association," which has for object the organization and encouragement of the sale of pamphlets, have disclosed the appalling fact that over one half of the public churches in England make no attempt whatever to sell C.T.S. literature and that in fact only 200 (or 10% of those which do) are in any way effective. Consequently, the stock-rooms of the C.T.S. are crowded with bales of literature which ought to be out working for the propagation of the Faith, and

output is checked because of the slow return of capital expended. In Ireland the sister Society has lately been reorganized by dioceses and parishes with the special object of obviating this defect, for there it is recognized that the church-door case performs a function analogous to, and hardly less important than, that of the pulpit.

**Growth of  
Decentralization.**

It is the same tendency that expresses itself here in the formation of provincial Branches, the success of which forms one of the most pleasing features of the Report. The Liverpool Branch, members of which on pilgrimage to Rome had lately an audience with the Pope, elicited from His Holiness warm praise of the whole Society, which will encourage those zealous in its cause. Its numbers, be it remembered, although so greatly increased, are still only a thousand over half the total aimed at, 30,000, and that itself represents a mere 5 % of the possible Catholic subscribers. There is need still for the Forward Movement, need for the zeal with which its originator, Mr. Reed Lewis, inspired it, need for the co-operation of clergy and laity to make the Society the power it ought to be. Part of its programme—to furnish a centre for Press-information and apologetic—is still in abeyance, and the decentralization scheme whereby the London organization will be repeated in every large centre, has only just begun to operate. The annual report of the Manchester branch, just to hand, shows that in that great city, as in Liverpool, every means of propaganda is actively employed, and that an especial effort is being made to secure the support of the clergy in the distribution of pamphlets. On that point, we are convinced, the whole future of the Society largely depends.

**Catholic  
Medical  
Ethics.**

The Guild of St. Luke, St. Cosmas and St. Damian exists to afford Catholic doctors, few and scattered amid a host of non-Catholic colleagues, the support which comes from association and the guidance afforded by the clear and definite moral teaching of the Church. It was, therefore, something of a shock to find, in the issue of its able periodical—*The Catholic Medical Guardian*—for January, certain views advocated, though not editorially, on the subject of embryotomy, which were quite at variance with Catholic ethics. They were those of a French doctor expressing his reasons for not wishing to join the Guild, but were partially at least endorsed by a British colleague who set them forth in the periodical. And they amounted to this—that in certain cases and in the last resort—the action of the physician should be determined by purely medical considera-



tions without reference to the moral law. It is obvious that this plea, itself immoral, would open the door to all sorts of immoral expedients, having in view some immediate medical advantage, and it was surprising that it was published without any editorial *caveat*. However, the current (April) issue of the *C.M.G.* contains an admirably reasoned refutation of these lax doctrines from the pen of Father H. Davis, Moral Professor at St. Beuno's,—one, as the editor tells us, of some half-dozen similar expostulations. It would have been better, we think, to have included the antidote with the poison, for some of those who have read the January number will not necessarily see the April one. In any case, the attitude of the French doctor is one which cannot be too strongly deprecated. If, as we nowadays very properly contend, Sovereign States themselves are under the dominion of the moral law, and even national interests must be pursued in strict accord with it, it is preposterous to hold that the exigencies of the medical—or for that matter, the legal—profession at times demand emancipation from morality. The Guild of St. Luke will have lost its very *raison d'être* if that view finds any support amongst its members.

THE EDITOR.

## III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

## CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

**Auto-Suggestion** diagnosed as Spiritism [Rev. E. Towers, D.D., in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, April, 1925, p. 389].

**Biblical Commission**, Nature of Assent to its Decrees [Hugh Pope, O.P., in *Blackfriars*, April, 1925, p. 222].

**Cremation**, why forbidden [J. R. Fletcher in *La Vie et les Arts liturgiques*, April, 1925, p. 273].

**Law**, Right Notions of [M. Riquet in *Etudes*, April 5, 1925, p. 5].

**Mystical Body**, Pauline doctrine of the [C. Tigar, S.J., in *Catholic Gazette*, April, 1925, p. 88].

**Mystical Body**, The Church as the [Rev. H. G. Hughes in *Ecclesiastical Review*, March, 1925, p. 225].

**Nicæa**: the meaning of [A. L. Maycock in *Month*, May, 1925, p. 385].

**St. Paul's** doctrine of the Church as the Kingdom of God [L. Cerfaux in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovaniensis*, April, 1925, p. 181].

**Salvation** outside the Church? [Rev. H. G. Hughes in *Tablet*, March 28, 1925, p. 402].

## CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

**Birth-Control** Propaganda in England [Dr. H. Sutherland in *Commonweal*, April 1, 1925, p. 568].

**Catholic** Seminaries and Press Defence [T. D. Roberts, S.J., in *Month*, May, 1925, p. 410].

**Douglas**, Mr. James: his misunderstanding of dogma [*Catholic Times*, April 11, 1925, p. 17].

"**National Churches**" not Catholic [C. Charlier, S.J., in *Month*, May, 1925, p. 425].

**Woman** and the Church: Anti-Catholic misrepresentations [*Ecclesiastical Review*, March, 1925, p. 290].

## POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

**Apostles'** relation to S. Peter [Rev. J. H. Stewart in *Ecclesiastical Review*, March, 1925, p. 259].

**Catholicity** in France not declining [A. H. Atteridge in *Catholic Gazette*, April, 1925, p. 94].

**Catholicism** in France: Some Corrections [E. Dimnet in *Commonweal*, April 8, 1925, p. 593].

**De Castellane-Gould** (Matrimonial) Case, End of [P. L. Blakely, S.J., in *America*, April 11, 1925].

**Opium**, How the Church fights its abuse [Felix Klein in *Commonweal*, March 25, 1925, p. 538].

**Overcrowding**, The Scandal of [V. McNabb, O.P. in *Catholic Times*, April 11, 1925, p. 1].

**Pastors**, Support of, and the Faith [Dr. A. MacDonald in *Ecclesiastical Review*, March, 1925, p. 254].

**Prohibition**, Ethics of [J. M. Prendergast, S.J., in *Homiletic Review*, April, 1925, p. 725].

# REVIEWS

## 1—BLESSED PETER CANISIUS<sup>1</sup>

IT is, and long will be, the duty and pleasure of every biographer of Peter Canisius to acknowledge obligations to the editor of the "Epistulae et Acta B.P. Canisii." In this monumental work of eight large volumes, reviewed periodically in our pages, Father Braunsberger, S.J., has incorporated the results of nearly forty years of unceasing research. Hardly less useful are the many brochures, encyclopædia and review articles from his pen, and, finally, the altogether admirable "Petrus Canisius, ein Lebensbild," first published in 1917.

Pater Metzler and l'Abbé Cristiani acknowledge their obligations, at least implicitly, as the attentive reader will discover on almost every page. Neither work, indeed, pretends to add anything materially to our knowledge of facts. Yet each, in its way, makes a real contribution to Canisius study.

L'Abbé Cristiani is known to all scholars as an eminent authority on Luther. Naturally, therefore, he sees Canisius, primarily, as the protagonist in a great drama in which Luther is the villain of the piece. What Luther was to that negative, destructive, fanatical religious movement in the first half of the sixteenth century, that Blessed Peter Canisius was to the positive, constructive and calm efforts at religious renewal, to which the name has been given of Counter-Reformation. While following, therefore, the narrative of facts as presented by Father Braunsberger, l'Abbé Cristiani never lets us forget this central *motif*; and the masterly summary, at the end, of the problems and significance of Blessed Peter's life shows the French mind working at its best.

Father Metzler's work is, in some ways, the most interesting of all recent studies of Canisius. After two chapters on Blessed Peter's early formation and vocation to be the Apostle of Germany the chronological method is abandoned. Instead, the main lines of the Saint's work—the apostolate of youth, of the pulpit, and of the press, his work as an ecclesiastical statesman and a religious superior—are singled out and each is pursued in turn. Finally, there is in the section headed "Bedeutung und Eigenart" a critical estimate, which is at the same time an inspiring pane-

<sup>1</sup> (1) *Petrus Canisius, ein Charakterbild*, von Johannes Metzler, S.J., mit einem Titelbild, einer Karte und 120 Abbildungen un Text, B. Kühlen, M. Gladbach, 1925.

(2) *Le Bienheureux Pierre Canisius (1521—1597)*, par l'Abbé L. Cristiani. Paris, Victor Lecoffre. Pp. 188. 1925.

gyric of the saintly apostle. But what gives particular value to this book are the illustrations. There are no less than 120 beautiful reproductions of the earliest authentic pictures of Canisius, and the more recent attempts to honour him, made by painters, sculptors and architects. A map at the end shows graphically the Saint's journeyings from North Germany to Sicily, and from Switzerland to Poland. He crossed the Alps a dozen times, and he left hardly a town unvisited in the valleys of the Rhine, Main and Upper Danube.

Both biographers emphasize the enormous output of Canisius' pen, but like all the former biographers make little attempt to summarize the contents of Blessed Peter's books. Yet as a model of controversial restraint Canisius is without a peer in the sixteenth century, and the matter of his expository works may bear comparison with that of some Doctors of the Church.

## 2—THE SCHOLASTIC THEORY OF MATTER<sup>1</sup>

IT would be difficult to give an adequate idea of the contents of this work without going into technical and abstruse questions of metaphysics which would be out of place in this review and which would require much space for their proper development. Briefly, the question at issue is whether the "peripatetic" doctrine of matter and form can be strictly proved, and, if so, by what arguments. The book took its rise from a recent controversy in the "Revue de Philosophie," whose able editor, the Abbé Peillaube, had taken exception to certain opinions expressed by Père Descoqs in a review-article published in that periodical (January, 1920). Like some other modern scholastic writers, Père Descoqs had ventured to express a doubt about the value of some of the traditional arguments. In particular, he criticized the very fundamental argument drawn from substantial changes in natural things. One cannot regret that his views were severely assailed by Peillaube, Gossard and other writers during a period of nearly two years, since this attack has given occasion to the very competent review of the entire question contained in the volume before us.

Very wisely, the author has extended his view beyond the original question in dispute; practically all the fundamental questions of Aristotelian metaphysics, and some important applications of these principles in dogmatic theology come up for consideration in these pages. This fact, which gives the work a very special value, also renders the reviewer's task exceptionally difficult. But some sort of *résumé* may be attempted.

<sup>1</sup> *Essai Critique sur l'Hylémorphisme*, par Pedro Descoqs, S.J. Paris: Beauchesne. Pp. 415. Price, 27 fr.

In the first four chapters (about one quarter of the book) the whole question of substantial transmutations in organic and inorganic nature is once again considered. Do such transmutations really occur in chemical combinations and in the function of nutrition in the living organism? Is the fact certain, demonstrable, or only probable? Is the alternative doctrine of a plurality of subordinate forms in one substance (living or non-living) absolutely excluded, taking into account all the new data of science? Père Descoqs thinks, and many will agree with him, that all the facts can be explained quite well on either hypothesis. And therefore, he concludes, neither hypothesis is scientifically proved. He himself avows his preference for the Thomistic doctrine of the strict unity of substantial form in each substance. But he denies that this theory can be proved from the facts assumed in the argument from substantial transmutations. To him, the fact that the physical and biological confirmation of the Thomistic view is so incomplete is a thing which scholastic philosophers must take account of. Facts can be interpreted upon this hypothesis, he admits, but there is no proof that they *need* be. All the proofs brought forward turn out on examination to be logically untenable. This is a point upon which some readers may differ from the author; while others, again, may think he has rather understated his case. Many hold that the evidence of science positively supports the doctrine of plurality of forms. But there can be no doubt, at any rate, that he is right in the main, so far as the criticism of his opponents' arguments is concerned. The discussion of this argument is very full, thorough and well-documented.

In the second part of his work, the author considers another important line of argument—that, namely, which is derived from the metaphysical doctrine of potency and act. Here, again, he finds the argument inadequate, and rightly points out that some statements of it are thoroughly fallacious. The treatment of the theory of individuation is particularly interesting in this connection (pp. 173 ff.).

Finally, in the third section, Père Descoqs develops the one argument by which, according to him, the hylomorphic doctrine can be proved. Neither physical arguments, as we have seen, nor the metaphysics of act and potency, appear to him to provide a sure basis of proof. The one certainly valid argument, he maintains, is the argument drawn from the nature of extended quantity. This is, of course, not a new argument. It was familiar to the scholastic doctors of the Middle Ages. We forbear to summarize the argument, which Père Descoqs set forth with great clearness and cogency. Even those who still retain an affection for the arguments discarded in this volume will admit, we think, that the author has made out a powerful case

for preferring this proof. If the system must fall back finally upon one single argument this is perhaps the strongest.

We confess that our own interest in this work is not mainly concerned with this particular thesis. Important as the question is, we think the work of Father Descoqs has a value of its own, almost independently of its subject-matter; namely, its value as an example of critical method and logical conscientiousness. The modern scholastic movement needs criticism to keep it fresh and vigorous. And such criticism can generally only come from within. External critics, whether through lack of detailed knowledge or through their alien mentality, seldom get to the real heart of the matter. Propositions which, to a scholastic writer, appear of high importance (and rightly so, from a systematic standpoint) will, to an outside critic, often appear as mere refinements and subtleties. Only a specialist in scholasticism is competent to deal with the remoter developments of scholastic principles.

In reading these pages we have been struck—we say it frankly—with the logical laxity of some of the author's scholastic opponents. It has been brought home to us again and again how much stronger men's convictions are than their arguments, with how little care the strength of assertion is proportioned to the weight of evidence. Most of the writers referred to are French, and French scholasticism, one would think, ought to be doubly insured on the logical side. Unfortunately, this is not the case with the writers whom Père Descoqs discusses. We find in their arguments that rhetorical questions too often usurp the place of syllogism, and *petitio principii* is scandalously frequent. If scholasticism is to be of any service to the modern world, it will not be by such slovenly methods as these. Père Descoqs has done a great service by insisting upon more rigorous standards. The main positions of the ancient philosophy will stand the most searching criticism; only we must not be afraid to apply it. Nor must the rejection of any particular line of proof be too readily condemned as implying a criminal design upon the whole structure. Each controversy must be conducted on its own merits, and, as far as possible, without regard to systematic convenience. An hypothesis is not true because it fits in with a certain system. On the contrary, the system's truth depends on the truth of its hypotheses. The rock on which so many philosophical systems have crashed is the fallacy of circular reasoning, which easily becomes an unconscious habit to minds dominated by a single idea. It is so easy to make the parts of a system prove one another, reciprocally! The controversies of the Middle Ages served a salutary purpose in keeping systematic dogmatism within tolerable bounds. System stood opposed to system, and no school could afford to



go to sleep on its own dogmas. The same work has to be done to-day if the prestige of Catholic philosophy as a sound school of reasoning is not to be compromised. And we see no other way of accomplishing the work than the old familiar way of internal controversy. Those who would abolish controversy must find another antidote against stagnation and decadence. It is because Father Descoqs' book is such a fine example of fruitful controversy that we heartily commend it to our readers.

---

### 3—SCIENCE AND RELIGION<sup>1</sup>

FOR seven or eight years the Catholic student of human origins and of those sciences which involve the subject of evolution have had a safe and fairly exhaustive guide in Professor Windle's familiar work, *The Church and Science*. In his own person the author combines the qualifications of a well-read and intelligent Catholic, fully alive to the implications of his faith, and a scientist of conspicuous ability and attainment. The combination secures a very competent treatment of those many questions wherein the findings and inferences of physical science seem at variance with what we know about Nature from revelation in Scripture or the Church. Under the Professor's skilled guidance, especially in his insistence upon the distinction between fact and theory, many alleged difficulties disappear, and the principles on which the solution of the rest may be expected are clearly set forth. The utility of his work is proved by the number of impressions made of it since its first appearance in 1917. This third edition, whilst keeping the main divisions of chapters and contents, has been thoroughly revised in the light of recent scientific theories and discoveries, which have provided the author with fresh illustrations of his main contention, the harmony of all real knowledge about creation whether derived from divine authority or human observation. It is a book which all Catholics should be introduced to before leaving school or college, for they will find in it all that is necessary to meet successfully the rationalist adversary in the gate of adolescence. We repeat the encomiums we gave it on its first appearance, convinced that thus revised and perfected its career of usefulness need know no limits.

<sup>1</sup> *The Church and Science*. By Sir B. C. A. Windle. London: Catholic Truth Society. Pp. xviii., 427. Price 7s. 6d. net.

4—ANOTHER DE MAISTRE<sup>1</sup>

PENDING a fuller notice of this important volume, which in some respects is worthy to rank with de Maistre's famous treatise on the Pope, we should like to call our readers' attention to its significance, which is all the greater because the *prestige* of the Papacy, greatly enhanced by the war, seems destined in the near future to be still further increased because of the need the world has of spiritual guidance and of the felt impossibility of finding it elsewhere. *Stat crux dum volvitur orbis*—the Church is the only stable thing amidst a whirlpool of contending interests which man-made religions cannot reconcile. M. Jean Carrère, the author of this book, has resided as a journalist in Rome for many years, and has made a profound study of the ancient and modern conditions of the Papacy. His brilliant sketch, although in one sense impressionist, does not conceal the careful historical work on which it is based. He does not, like de Maistre, fill in the outlines of his picture, but it is all the more vivid because of its omission of unnecessary details. Briefly, he conceives the Papacy as the God-sent, God-representing instrument, whereby man is prevented from confining his interests to this world and reminded and helped to prepare himself for the next. In consequence, it is in necessary contrast with that other great institution, also designed by God for human welfare, the State, and in necessary antagonism with it, in so far as it tries to usurp the whole of man's attention, and service. The history of Christian civilization is thus conceived as the outcome of the various phases of a perennial conflict, that between Peter and Cæsar, the supernatural and the natural, the Church and the State—a conflict which in a fallen world will never be stilled till the world is finally redeemed, and the State ceases to be. In the success of Peter, as M. Carrère convincingly shows, has lain the true liberty of man: when Cæsar triumphs there is despotism and slavery. Perhaps one day the world, drugged for three centuries by false history and philosophy, will realize this fact.

The second and larger portion of the book is devoted to the particular relations between the Papacy and Italy, and thus deals with a subject which to some extent is still a matter of legitimate dispute amongst Catholics. But his whole treatment of "The Roman Question" takes cognizance both of what the Popes have declared to be its just solution and of the varying attitude of the State. His discussion cannot but make for peace and understanding, and may itself hasten the day of reconciliation. We commend this striking volume very heartily to our readers as a valuable contribution to true history.

<sup>1</sup> *The Pope*. By Jean Carrère. Translated by Arthur Chambers. London: Hutchinson and Co. Pp. 278. Price 18s. net.

5—THE FOUR LAST THINGS<sup>1</sup>

**D**IVINE Providence has left vague and undetermined a great many questions concerning the fate of mankind after death. What is essential to right living has been revealed—that God will render unto every man according to his works, that the final judgment is inevitable and that its result for the immortal soul is the gain or loss of eternal happiness. No one, as far as revelation is concerned, can deny service or put off repentance on the grounds that his responsibility for his own life and destiny has not been adequately made known to him. But what seems to us the haphazard way in which God's revelation reaches mankind, and the undoubted fact that it does not reach at all a vast multitude who have not the opportunity or capacity for understanding it, raises a number of interesting points about which the Christian intellect cannot gain absolute certainty. In Dr. Arendzen's treatise, written in non-technical language for the ordinary educated Catholic, what is certain and what is not are clearly differentiated, and the various degrees of probability for various theories carefully set forth. When speculation is free, conclusions will differ, but we are glad to note that Dr. Arendzen, unlike certain early and mediæval theologians, is anxious to vindicate the essential mercy as well as the essential justice of God. The problems discussed are numerous—the state of the pre-Christian world, the fate of the heathen, personal immortality, the character of Purgatory, the punishment of fire, apparitions of the dead, etc., etc., and the reader will find no difficulty shirked, even though at times the mind is baffled by mystery. Dr. Arendzen is to be congratulated on the production of this timely and helpful volume.

<sup>1</sup> *What Becomes of the Dead? A Study in Eschatology.* By J. P. Arendzen, M.A., D.Ph., D.D. London: Sands and Co. Pp. 287. Price, 6s. net.

## SHORT NOTICES.

## BIBLICAL.

**S**O great and varied is the output of work on the Scriptures coming from the writers connected with the great Pontifical Biblical Institute that it has to find expression in three distinct periodical publications, viz., "*Orientalia*," dealing with matters of research in the ancient civilizations of the East—Assyria, Arabia, Egypt—and issued in monographs at irregular intervals; "*Biblica*," a quarterly journal devoted to the investigation and discussion of Scripture subjects, and finally *Verbum Domini*, published monthly and containing rather the ascertained results of the labours

of the various Professors and writers who work for the Institute. The last-named periodical is clearly that which appeals most to those who are not Biblical experts and yet who wish to keep in touch with the various questions always recurring in the inexhaustible field of Biblical research. It has now completed its second year of issue, having started in January, 1923, and a perusal of the contents of these two volumes, each of about 390 pages and costing 20 francs, shows how vast is the treasure amassed from the whole terrain of Scripture studies for the benefit of the clergy in this most useful periodical. It is written, of course, in Latin, and printed with all the skill and finish for which the Pontifical Press is noted.

#### PHILOSOPHICAL.

In *Wege der Weltweisheit*, by Bernhard Jansen, S.J. (Herder: 9s.), we have another of those attempts, so congenial to the German mind, to examine the problems of Life and Religion in the light of philosophy. For those who have difficulties or even doubts of the sort we label epistemological, metaphysical or psychological, we recommend the reading of this book. Father Jansen is specially skilful in showing the bearing of Catholic thinkers on modern thought. From this point of view the most interesting chapters are: "Augustinus ein moderner Denker," and "Die Eigenart des Aquinaten und unsere Zeit."

Only very serious scholars, with stout hearts and strong heads will appreciate the importance of Professor Johann Peter Staffes' new work on the Philosophy of Religion, *Religionsphilosophie* (Kösel and Pustet, München). It is a novel and notable attempt, by a Catholic thinker, to treat of Religion, in a purely philosophical way, with a minimum of postulates and without apologetic purpose. It is described as "ein Lehr und Lernbuch," and is meant, therefore, for the learned and the learner. But to the beginner, this quest for the existence and revelation of God, in the phenomena of nature and history, will prove to be the austere of pilgrimages. If any man will share this feast, let him prove himself by expressing in clear thoughts and plain English such a sentence as this: Deshalb wird hier eine Philosophie angestrebt, die grundsätzlich kritisch—realistisch und metaphysisch ist und sich um die synthetische Fruchtbarmachung aller Motive bemüht; die mit der Bewusstseins—eine Dingerfassung, mit der Tatsachen,—Entwicklungs—und Wirklichkeitserforschung eine Wesendutung zu verbinden sucht!

#### APOLOGETIC.

We are, perhaps, freer in England from religious extravagances on a large scale, than is the case in either Germany or America. Nevertheless there is much in *Religiöse Volksströmungen der Gegenwart* (herausgegeben von Dr. Arthur Allgeier, Herder: 3s.) that may be profitable for English priests. In half a dozen conferences by competent spiritual guides we have searching analyses of the causes, character and consequences of the most notable religious aberrations of our day. Particularly useful are the papers headed "Unsere Seelsorge und die Sekten" and "Okkultismus und Spiritismus."

Under the striking title, *The Unknown God* (Herder: St. Louis), the Rev. John A. McClorey, S.J., publishes seven lectures in which he describes the sceptical attitude of the modern world towards Christianity

in general and the Catholic Church in particular, and endeavours to obtain a hearing for the Catholic argument. Father McClorey has the speaker's gifts of forcefulness and eloquence united to the philosophic temperament. Hence we have here a vigorous restatement of the Church's position. It has been well said that what we need most at present are not new truths, but a restatement of some old truths in terms of modern life. "The Unknown God" is a worthy effort to supply this need.

## CANON LAW.

The Rev. Francis Joseph Winslow, J.C.L., of the Catholic Foreign Missionary Society has turned out in New York **Vicars and Prefects Apostolic**: A Dissertation submitted to the faculty of Canon Law of the Catholic University of America, a very promising and scholarly piece of writing which should be very useful to those whose rights and duties are explained in it. After a short historical introduction, Father Winslow discusses the part of the Code which deals with Vicars and Prefects Apostolic. His interpretation of the Canons is close to the text, sober, supported by approved authors, and most frequently based on the previous but often unchanged legislation of the Propaganda. A good half of the book is taken up with a commentary on the special faculties given by the Holy See to Vicars and Prefects Apostolic, which is carefully done, as it deals with the whole of the matter contained in the faculty, e.g., non-fasting communion of the sick. It may be pointed out that to translate (p. 12) "dies natalis Apostoli" as "the day of birth" is misleading: it is, of course, the supposed date of death. The laws made by Vicars Apostolic are said (p. 15) to bind when they are promulgated, unless the contrary is stated. But since no law binds before it is promulgated it would have been clearer to translate the Canon (335) as it stands, *sc.*, such laws begin to bind immediately after they are promulgated unless the contrary is stated. The author thinks (pp. 16 and 79) that the rule laid down in Canon 201 as to the manner of using judicial and voluntary jurisdiction applies to the special faculties given by Propaganda. He would allow them to use their dispensing power outside their own territory. But Propaganda expressly restricts the use of these special faculties to the territory. Further, the statement in Canon 201 is not absolute: it is limited by the words "nisi ex jure constet." The law has spoken when the faculties were issued.

## PSYCHOLOGY.

MM. le Abbé Arnaud D'Agnel et Docteur D'Espiney, in **Psychologie et Psychothérapie éducatives** (Tequi. 608 pages. Price: 13 fr. 50), have produced a valuable contribution to the literature of educational psychology which should prove to be a boon to the parents and teachers for whom it is primarily written. It contains a good summary of the investigations which, during recent years, have attracted such a large share of attention among psychologists. The volume is divided into two parts. The first—and by far the most important—treats of educational psychology and contains a comprehensive study of normal child-psychology. In the shorter section of the work (90 pages) the authors concern themselves with the therapeutic measures which have been proved efficient in education. They emphasize the profound influence which bodily func-

tions and abnormalities exercise on mental development, and offer valuable evidence for the educational importance of suggestion, the correction of physical defects, etc. There is also a tempered critical study of the relation of psycho-analysis to education. This section of the book will be helpful to those who deal with backward or mentally deficient children. Whenever it is possible technical terms are translated into language that is intelligible to the reader who is not versed in psychological terminology. The style is easy, the matter well chosen and attractively presented. The extensive bibliography is confined almost exclusively to French works, though frequent reference to English and German periodicals is made in the text. We commend the book as a manual for serious minded educators.

#### SOCIOLOGY.

The purpose of Father Henry Spalding's **Chapters in Social History** (Heath and Company: New York) is to supply a much needed historical background for the growing study of social endeavour. Social endeavour, as a theory and inchoative science, is modern; but, in practice, it is as old as Christianity. As sound theory must be based on facts, one can have little hope for sociology unless it survey the past and draw conclusions from the whole field of premisses. Certain prepossessions have led modern theorists to attach little importance to the social machinery of the middle ages. Such an attitude cannot help science. Father Spalding's book, although merely scratching the surface of a neglected field, will be a revelation to many students of social work. Out of the twenty-four chapters, into which his book is divided, he devotes seventeen to social conditions in Europe prior to the Reformation; three to the social effects of the Reformation; three to Catholic social endeavour in modern times; and concludes with a chapter on the evils arising from the introduction of machinery during the last century. The book is arranged as text-book, with a brief analysis prefixed to each chapter, and at the end of the chapter, a list of topics and questions for discussion, and references for further study. The volume is also provided with an index. Unlike most text-books, "Chapters in Social History" will be found an intensely interesting book by the general reader, especially if he be a Catholic. Catholics have been too much the victims of the modern conspiracy of silence against the middle ages. A book like this, with each chapter serving as a window through which we obtain interesting glimpses into a past full of charm, should not be confined to the class-room. Another pleasant feature of the volume is the attractive and unfamiliar illustrations with which it is liberally furnished.

#### HISTORICAL.

**England under the Early Tudors**, by C. H. Williams, M.A. (Longmans: 9s. 6d.), is the sixth volume of the "London University Intermediate Source-Books of History" and embraces the years 1485-1529. A due proportion is kept in this volume in the space assigned to the various aspects of the period: political, constitutional, economic, etc., and a useful introduction on the sources together with a select list of modern authorities, and a carefully compiled index make the book an excellent one for indoctrinating the young student in the use of his sources and authorities.



Those interested in the History of the Church in America will welcome the publication of another volume of Father Peter Guilday's researches on that subject. **The Catholic Church in Virginia (1815-1822)** (New York: The United States Catholic Historical Society) deals with the far from edifying story of the Norfolk Schism, and may be regarded as a preliminary study for a "Life and Times of John England, first Bishop of Charleston," for which the author has been collecting materials these past three years. Though on the main outlines of the Church's history in the Carolinas, especially in Charleston, during the years 1815-1822, almost at every turn the spirit and influence of the Norfolk schismatics can be seen and felt; yet the story of the Norfolk schism has certain individual aspects which prevent a blending of its narrative with that of the more dangerous schism of Charleston, and for this reason as well as for others the history of the Norfolk Church is here given separately. Throughout, the author follows the method used in his *Life and Times of John Carroll*: it is the document that dominates: the original source alone is allowed to speak, and to speak abundantly. Interpretation is offered only where collateral documents or secondary sources prompt it. There is no attempt at fine writing: no moralizing. The result is a sound piece of historical research.

The posthumous work of M. Ferdinand Chalandon, *Histoire de la Première Croisade* (Picard: 25.00 fr.), merits attention, as the learned author had made the subject of the Crusades particularly his own, by his study of the Comneni. His researches convinced him that the majority of those who had studied the Crusades, had treated the question far too exclusively from the Western point of view. Influenced by the authorities on this side, without due attention being paid to the Greek chronicles, they tended to make Alexius Comnenus the scape-goat of all the faults of the Crusaders. "For long years historians," he asserted in a previous work (*Cambridge Medieval History*, iv. 333), "have indulged in cheap denunciations of the ingratitude and perfidy of Alexius Comnenus, who, after having solicited help from the Western nations against the Turks, ceased not, throughout the Crusade, to throw all kinds of obstacles in their way, so that his false and treacherous conduct was the cause of all the evils which fell upon the first Crusaders. A closer examination of the sources, allows us partially at least, to acquit the Emperor of the charges brought against him." This is the theses of his volume on the first Crusade; but it is worked out with far greater wealth of detail than was possible in a chapter in the "Cambridge Medieval History"; and in our opinion the author has gone far in the present work to establish the point. The initiative of the Crusade he ascribes entirely to Pope Urban II.: "on ne saurait attribuer ni à un clerc ni à un laïc quelconque l'initiative de la Croisade; tout le mérite doit en revenir au pape Urban II., qui chercha à entreprendre en Orient ce que l'ordre de Cluny avait entrepris depuis plus de cinquante ans en Espagne" (p. 32). It is indeed now generally acknowledged that Urban II. in preaching the Crusade, by no means did so in response to a desire expressed by Alexius Comnenus; there was no solicitation on the part of the Greek Emperor for a Crusade as such, i.e., for a general expedition to deliver the Holy Places from Mohammedan tyranny; on the other hand there is evidence from the contemporary, Bernard, who is generally well informed, that Alexius did ask the Pope to favour the enrolment of auxiliaries in the West to

aid him against his pagan enemies; and it was quite unnecessary for our author's thesis to throw doubt on it; on this point he is far from convincing. Nor does he carry more conviction in postdating the enthusiasm for the Crusades, and ascribing it to the capture of Jerusalem; hard facts are against such an opinion, though doubtless the success achieved increased the already existing enthusiasm. The author is also in error in the statement that up to the wars of Spain against the Mussulman the Church of that country had been independent of Rome: "Jusque là l'Eglise d'Espagne avait été indépendante, et Rome réussit à lui imposer son autorité absolue" (p. 12). Though a note was evidently to be appended, no authority *de facto* is given for this gratuitous assertion, which is quite contrary to fact. Apart from these blemishes, the work is a notable contribution to the study of the Crusades.

In **The Catholic Reaction in France** (Macmillan, London) Mr. Denis Gwynn has brought together a number of sketches of the post-war conditions of the Church in that country, beginning with the all-important enquiry: "How much of France is Catholic?" They are the work of a keen observer who has spent several years in the country and is evidently well acquainted with the aims and activities of the different Catholic groups. His impressions on the whole are pessimistic: he thinks that Catholic adhesion to the Republic is not genuine enough or widely enough extended to have its due influence upon the Government. Although this view has been traversed by a still higher authority, the Abbé Dimnet, in effect it would seem that French Catholics have not hitherto "pulled their weight" in guiding the destinies of their country. However, as his title indicates, Mr. Gwynn finds many signs of a change, and recent events (his book is dated in April, 1924) would doubtless make him more hopeful. The book, as it stands, is very helpful towards an understanding of the situation in France.

Although nothing new remains to be said concerning the origins of the "National Church" of this country, Mr. Joseph Clayton's **The Historical Basis of Anglicanism: a Short Survey of the Foundations of the Anglican Communion** (Sands and Co.: 6s.) brings together in a cogent exposition the salient facts of an historical episode which has been almost as much overloaded with fiction and false interpretation as the foundation of Christianity itself. The story is indeed plain if not obscured by irrelevant detail. Its lesson is summed up, in a Preface by Father Bede Jarrett, O.P., in six propositions, "manifestly true," which put beyond all doubt the purpose of the English Reformers to discard essentially Catholic doctrines and break their association with the then Living Church—a purpose which they all too successfully carried out. Mr. Clayton has the gift of a lucid style, and his trained historical sense enables him to grasp the full significance of the events he chronicles. We cannot conceive any fair-minded Anglican studying this little volume without realizing the historical insecurity of his religious position.

Two of Father Robert Bracey's **Eighteenth Century Studies** (Blackwell: 5s. net) originally appeared in *The Month*, so our readers will be prepared to find in the book a scholarly description of bye-gone times and personages from a mind saturated in the literature of the period and skilled in interpreting its spirit. Dr. Johnson seems to be the subject of the author's closest study, but he ranges over a wide field both at home and abroad, and he revives our interest in many forgotten themes.

We welcomed a couple of years ago Mr. F. A. Simpson's study of Napoleon III., called, *Louis Napoleon and the Recovery of France*, and hoped that he would continue the work. We were not then aware that the author as long ago as 1909 had already devoted a work to the same fascinating personality, a work which he has now republished in a second edition with such few changes as recent research requires and an up-to-date bibliography. Its title is *The Rise of Louis Napoleon* (Longmans: 15s.). Although as a man it is hard to find much to admire in Louis Napoleon, who was morally weak and only strong in the strength of a devouring ambition and a subtle brain devoted to its service, there is no doubt that the story of his fortunes contains all the elements of a poignant drama. Mr. Simpson never allows the sympathy which led him to study Napoleon's career to blind him to his moral faults, and so he succeeds in giving him his true place in nineteenth century history. Especially valuable is the introductory chapter explaining the genesis and growth of the "Napoleonic legend" which was the chief factor in the surprising success of the great Emperor's namesake.

#### NON-CATHOLIC WORKS.

Revelation naturally plays a large part in God's earlier dealings with His creatures. The Bible, in both the Old and New Testaments, furnishes us with many examples. The *Filosofia della Rivelazione*, by Ascanio Mele (A. Signorelli: 15 lire), is an examination of these various manifestations of God to man with a view to arriving at a definition of revelation. In the first part the author dwells on the communications of God with His chosen people, while he devotes the second part to a consideration of Christology. The very first paragraph of the book furnishes the reader with a general concept of revelation which, according to the author, is not an exclusive property of Christianity. Religion and revelation are inextricably bound up together. The author rightly asserts that the idea of God is not innate, but he seems to infer that God must reveal the knowledge of His existence in some supernatural way. We are led to make such an inference from what he says on p. 41: "God exists and is known in so far as He reveals Himself," and again on p. 28: "Religion, as an ideal organism, comes from the collective conscience of the people." As far as we may judge, the author seems to hold that we cannot prove the existence of God from the visible phenomena of the world. He naturally rejects the idea that we can base our knowledge of God on mere natural experiences, but he would seem to go too far in asserting that we cannot arrive at the knowledge of God without the aid of supernatural revelation. The Vatican Council has decided otherwise. Needless to say, such an exposition of merely personal views has received no ecclesiastical *Imprimatur*.

A little handbook called *Rome and the Holy Church* (S.P.C.K.: 1s. 6d.), by the Rev. C. F. Rogers, Professor of Pastoral Theology, King's College, London, is given as "a study of evidence." It takes the classical Petrine texts and some of the usual quotations from the Fathers and seeks to find in them a sense which would exclude, or at least not involve, what has been found in them by Catholic theologians. It follows Pullar, Denny and Co., but with a difference, for the author is uniformly polite to Rome. But the booklet illustrates once more the confession of Bishop Gore that "it would seem that something deeper than historical considerations

really determines our respective convictions." Thus, St. Chrysostom appears herein only as the author of a single short quotation declaring that the Church is built upon the *confession* of Peter: the "something deeper" seemingly blinding Mr. Rogers to his clear and reiterated testimony to the Supremacy. Leaving "historical considerations," let us emphasize the conclusion drawn by the author—"Though the English Church may have many faults, and the Roman (as she undoubtedly has) many virtues, we have this advantage over her, that we do not claim to be infallible." This is a strange matter for self-congratulation in a Church that claims to be commissioned by Christ to teach in His name and with His authority. "Go and teach," "He that heareth you, heareth me." Not so does the Church of Mr. Rogers teach, but in every utterance it reminds the disciple that, as it does not claim to be infallible, its teaching may be false. Only such a Church as this could complacently boast of a doctrinal comprehensiveness which enables Lord Halifax, Dean Inge, Bishop Barnes, Bishop Gore and Mr. Kensit to claim, one and all, to be its faithful adherents.

#### FICTION.

**The Red Horse** (Grant Richards: 7s. 6d. net), by Christopher Rover, must stand nearly alone as a study of Soviet Russia and of the effects of war in a small Flemish town. The theme of the latter is the effect of the intermingling of British and Flemish, as judged by the state of Bierzele in 1914, 1916, and 1917. What looked so hopeful, proved disastrous. The solution is, not that the mingling of lives is bad, but that their mingling in such circumstances is: War makes, in the long run, neither for honesty, for chastity, nor for love. The Russian story shows the destructive force, there too, of violence. Even the Bolshevik ideals, principles, and standards disappear. Moral chaos, intellectual despair, cynical clinging to remunerative positions alone survive. These "lessons" are not taught lesson-wise. The tales are like Maurice Baring's for detachment and for first-hand (one cannot doubt) observation. A French clarity coupled with I know not what of Russian feeling—quite uncanny when applied in a study of British officers and men—gives you no chance of remaining unconvinced.

**Le Loup et le Chien**, by M. André Delacour (Bloud et Gay, pp. 215, 7.50 fr.), contains the tragedy of those who have fought the war and have no principles sufficient to carry them through the hour of disillusionment. The war has picked up a young man from the University, shaken him to the soul, made him feel his Self. Peace plunges him into a teaching job where that Self seems like to be drowned. He cannot keep his fierce protest against society, quite unregenerate, out of his lessons. A vulgar profiteer, still on the make, breaks him. Refusing the obscure situation to which authority seeks to relegate him, he embarks on journalism, and succeeds in all ways save the one he cares for—the development and application of his individuality. An American film-man meets him, opens to him a life of travel and thrill, he escapes from wife and childless home, and leaves her a cheque and the assurance that his goodbye kiss (enclosed) shall drink up the few tears that the separation may cost her. After all, she can divorce him, and the friend who introduced him to the newspaper is ready to marry her. We understand and grieve over the disarray created and left behind by war in such a soul. We regret that never

does the young man seek, one would say, to conquer his selfishness and his nerves—well, how can he, since he has no principles, any more than his wife's disgusting friend who counsels her to go off to another man—"why not, since she no longer loves her husband?" Such social collapse is in itself an argument of the necessity of the one remedy the book does not mention and thereby forces the reader to cry out for.

Miss Cecily Hallack, in her *Candlelight Attic* (B.O. and W.: 3s. 6d.),—a booklet in a charmingly designed wrapper from the author's own hand—has aimed a little higher than she did in her sketches of lovable Boy Scouts, *Beardless Counsellors*: although there was much in the former book that finds an echo here. Her "Seven True Stories of the Supernatural," told amid a sharply defined circle of friends out of whose—sometimes playful, sometimes profound,—conversation, the tales take substance quite naturally, reveal a spiritual insight and a dramatic instinct which cunningly combine thrills with edification. A delightful gift-book, destined to be cherished and re-read, even by those who are not mystics.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

The latest book of Dr. F. J. Kinsman, *Americanism and Catholicism* (Longmans: 9s. net), has been written in the hope of fostering mutual understanding and appreciation between non-Catholic and Catholic Americans. The author assumes his task with a cheerful confidence because, in his own words, "the American national genius has much in common with the Catholic religious spirit, which, in its turn, is uniquely useful in supporting certain American ideals." Certainly the Americanism of Washington, Lincoln and Roosevelt—and it is such Americanism that Dr. Kinsman extols—is favourable to the spread of Catholicity, the phenomenal growth of which in the United States demonstrates the fact. It may be questioned, however, whether such Americanism prevails so uniformly to-day as Dr. Kinsman might lead his readers to suppose. It seems to us that he is somewhat optimistic in his estimate of the thoroughness and speed with which foreigners become Americans. The recent restrictions on emigration are a confession that the "melting pot" has not been operating with efficiency. It is possible for emigrants to throw off some of their foreign ways and take out citizenship papers in the United States without being conversant with the traditions or imbued with the ideals which Dr. Kinsman portrays so well, as characteristic of real Americanism. The periodic waves of bigotry which break themselves against the Church in America are actuated by an ignorance which, to some extent, has been transplanted from other lands. It is an ignorance which is equally profound in respect both to Americanism and Catholicism. Dr. Kinsman does his countrymen a double service by instructing them on the real meaning of both. His long association with the Protestant Church renders him particularly well fitted to appreciate the non-Catholic point of view and to treat its difficulties kindly. His position as ex-bishop of Delaware lends an added weight to his scholarly work. We wish it every success.

We have Father Rickaby's word for it that he is an old man, and certain items in *An Old Man's Jottings* (Longmans: 7s. 6d. net) do deal with the experiences of old age, its drawbacks and its compensations; but there is no other sign of years in these thoughtful and pithy comments

on many subjects than a certain mellow wisdom, not certainly characteristic of youth. The "Jottings" cover a wide range of interests— theological, philosophical, devotional—and vary in length from a few lines to a couple of pages. But they always embody some suggestive idea aptly expressed and illustrated, or put an old truth in a new and striking setting. Nowhere, for instance, do we find the salient points of Anglican controversy better stated—that appeal to antiquity which ignores the Living Church, that unauthorized assumption of the most awful functions and responsibilities, that studied ignoring of clamant historical facts—"Anglican priests attempting to say Mass will be the ruin of the Church of England"—nowhere has the root error of Modernism been better exposed, nor the relations between the Church and the World more clearly set forth. We are loth to think that there is no more wood left, chips from the floor of that workshop, wherein for half a century and more Father Rickaby has shaped and elaborated the books which contain his message to his generation—and to many yet to come. Anyhow, here we have a very welcome instalment, the high thoughts of one ever given to high-thinking, the ripe judgments of one who has all his life conversed with the works of saint and scholar. There are 268 "Jottings" in all and we find that we had marked the majority of them for notice: it seems preferable to assume that the reader will hasten to get the book for personal inspection. It is one which all, learned or not, may read with enjoyment and profit.

Most good Christians who visit Palestine are tempted to write a book. It is well that they should do so; but the result should be submitted to some competent authority to extract the essence for an annual publication. Such a record of real contributions to the subject would be precious. Miss Winifred Wilson—a devout Anglican with no bigotry—would add to the general stock several interesting impressions and vivid descriptions; but there is scarcely enough matter for a volume. However, such a charming sketch as she has written—*My Pilgrimage in Palestine and Syria* (Drane's, Ltd.: London)—though slight, is one real tribute to the Holy Land and may well set others longing to visit "these holy fields." It is surprising that "Tiberius" (*sic*) should be printed boldly several times. "Kerf Kenna" should surely be "Kefr Kenna" and "Tal Avive," "Tel Aviv," the well-known suburb of Jaffa. The illustrations are excellent. This three months' trip took place since the War, but there is no means of fixing the year—or the price.

The appeal made by the Prime Minister for a united effort by all parties in the cause of social reform finds a sort of commentary in a little book by an Anglican sociologist, called *England at the Cross Roads* (The Damian Press: 6s. net). Mr. Kenneth Ingram diagnoses acutely from the Christian standpoint the various ills from which the community suffers—the absence of real supernatural religion being the chief—he then conceives his own Utopia wherein all difficulties are removed by processes of reason under the guidance of faith. It is an interesting and stimulating book.

We no longer divorce economics from ethics, at least in theory: the Manchester school has gone to a dishonoured grave. So one is not surprised to find a book like *The Christian Outlook* (Longmans: 4s. 6d. net) written by Sir William Ashley, one of the foremost economic writers



of the day. Though not, we gather, in Orders, Sir William has as a matter of fact *preached* these essays in various churches, and on the whole they are admirable as insisting upon this life as a preparation for the next. The theological groundwork of these discourses is not always without flaw, but they are instinct with a high moral purpose.

## MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

The publications of the C.T.S. of Ireland do not deal in such large measure as that of England with expositions of doctrine or refutations of calumnies. Many are purely devotional, like Dr. Coffey's **God's Nearness to us in Loneliness** (one of a batch recently received), or sociological, like the same writer's **The Christian Family and the Higher Ideal**, or Bishop McKenna's **The Christian Family and its Internal Enemies**, or two others connected with the same theme, **Religion at the Hearth** and **The Influence of Reading on the Christian Family**, by other members of the hierarchy. Then there are Saints' Lives, like Mrs. Conor Maguire's **Saint Colette of Corbie**, and a large selection of fiction, many of the stories (eighteen, no less) written by Miss Mary McKenna being bound together in one handsome volume at 2s. The practical needs of Ireland are provided for in a valuable description of **Catholic Organization in Holland**, with its subtitle, "A Lesson for Ireland," compiled from an MS. of the Rev. J. Schrijnen, S.J. Altogether the Irish C.T.S. seems to be growing in output as well as in membership.

The gross attack on the Spanish monarch by the infidel Ibanez, which happily has over-reached itself by its falseness and exaggeration, is adequately if indirectly answered by S. Salvador Canals in an article published in *Le Correspondent* and now translated and produced in English with the title, **Spain: the Monarchy and the Constitution** (E. E. Owens and Co.: Peckham).

In no English diocese is the religious instruction of school-children more carefully provided for than in the archdiocese of Birmingham, whence proceeds that valuable little educational monthly, *The Sower*, **The Annual Report on the Religious Inspection of Schools, 1924** (Hall and English), by the diocesan Inspector, who is also the Editor of *The Sower*, is therefore of exceptional interest, and well worth studying by Catholic teachers everywhere.

A C.T.S. booklet, called **Between Ourselves or Talks to Boys on Different Things**, by Mr. Joseph O'Connor, would please the Birmingham Inspector, for it is entirely devoted to making religion, the greatest of realities, real to immature minds. Mr. O'Connor well knows the difference between being "good" and "goody-goody."

We have to notice two useful reprints of the C.T.S.: **Hell**, by Father Joseph Rickaby, and **Vespers of Our Lady**, edited by Father Martindale.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

- BRUCE PUBLISHING CO., Milwaukee.  
*Everyman and The Second Shepherd's Play.* By W. R. Duffey. Pp. 87.
- BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE, London.  
*The Acts of the Apostles.* By Madam Cecilia. Book I. Pp. xxi. 494. Book II. Pp. 309. Price (in one volume), 8s. 6d. *The Riches of the Poor Man.* By P. J. O'C. Duffy. Pp. vii. 202. Price, 5s. *A Dominican Tertiary.* By Evelyn L. Thomas. Pp. ix. 51. Price, 1s. *The Life and Works of Blessed Michael Garicoits.* By J. F. Makepeace. Pp. viii. 72. Price, 2s. *Honour thy Mother.* By Fr. Alexander, O.F.M. Pp. vii. 83. Price, 1s. 6d. *A Manual of Moral Theology.* 2 Vols. by Fr. T. Slater, S.J. Pp. xii. 367; ix. 352. Price, 25s. *London Streets and Catholic Memorials.* By Canon E. H. Burton. Pp. ix. 170. Price, 5s. *St. Francis of Sales and The Introduction to the Devout Life.* Edited by Fr. A. Ross, Cong. Orat. Pp. xi. 124. Price, 3s. 6d. *Summa Theologica of St Thomas: Index.* Pp. vii. 296. Price, 12s. *Candlelight Altar.* By Cecily Hallack. Pp. vii. 119. Price, 3s. 6d.
- C.T.S., London.  
*Several Twopenny Pamphlets. The Church and Science.* By Prof. Sir B. Windle. Pp. xviii. 427. Price, 7s. 6d.
- C.T.S. OF IRELAND, Dublin.  
*Steering Homewards and other Tales.* By M. T. McKenna. Pp. 200. Price, 2s. *Several Twopenny Pamphlets.*
- GABALDA, Paris.  
*Catholicisme et Papauté.* By Mgr. Pierre Batiffol. Pp. 126. Price, 4.00 fr.
- HERDER, Freiburg.  
*Zu Füßen des Meisters.* By Anton Huonder. 2nd Vol. Pp. xii. 430. Price, 5.20 marks. *Auf des Herrn Pfaden.* By Karl Haggene. 2 Vols. Pp. xxii. 1074. Price, 6.40 marks each.
- J. T. NIX CLINIC, New Orleans.  
*The Unborn.* By J. T. Nix, M.D. Pp. 112.
- KEGAN PAUL & Co., London.  
*The Apostles' Creed.* By Rt. Rev. A. Macdonald, D.D. 2nd. edit. Pp. xvi. 347. Price, 10s. 6d. n.
- LETHIELLEUX, Paris.  
*Les belles Prières de Ste Mechtilde et Ste Gertrude.* Translated by D. A. Castel, O.S.B. Pp. xxiii. 160. Price, 4.50 fr.
- LONGMANS, London.  
*The English Version of "The Ship of Fools."* By Fr. Aurelius Popen, O.F.M. Pp. xiv. 345. Price, 21s. *The Teaching of Mary Aikenhead.* By a Member of her Congregation. Pp. viii. 156. Price, 2s. n.
- NICHOLAS F. WILLIS, London.  
*The Tyranny of Virtue.* By Noel Despard. Pp. 302. Price, 6s. n.
- PLON, NOURRIT ET CIE, Paris.  
*Maggy.* By P. M. Lekeux, O.F.M. Pp. iv. 264. Price, 7.50 fr.
- SANDS & Co., London.  
*What Becomes of the Dead?* By J. P. Arendzen, D.D. Pp. 287. Price, 6s. n. *The Sanctuary of Strength.* By Robert Eaton, Cong. Orat. Pp. x. 285. Price, 6s. n.
- TALBOT PRESS, Dublin.  
*The World's Debt to the Catholic Church.* By James J. Walsh. Pp. 319. Price, 6s. n.
- "VITA ET PENSIERO," Milan.  
*Politica Economica Internazionale Inglese.* By Jacopo Mazzei. Pp. xix. 460. Price, 25 l. *Immanuel Kant (1724-1924).* Edited by P. A. Gemelli, O.F.M. Pp. 323. Price, 15 l. *Saggi e Studi di Antichità.* By A. Calderini. Pp. xviii. 301. Price, 25 l. *Lo Studio e la Classificazione dei Fanciulli anormali.* By L. Necchi. Pp. 96. Price, 6 l. *Sulla Frequenza della Eredità nei Fanciulli anormali.* By Dr. J. Pastori. Pp. 132. Price, 8 l. *Vito Fornari.* By Dr. U. Padovani. Pp. 219. Price, 12 l. and *Three other Pamphlets.*

D.

A.

p.

et

A.

o.

f

o.

A.

o.

l